

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (3), by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and by in-

serting after such clause a new clause as follows:

"(5) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in special educational programs for bilingual students."

AMENDMENTS TO COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT

Sec. 5, subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Cooperative Research Act are each amended by inserting "and title VII" after "section 503(a)(4)".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Why art thou cast down, O my soul?
Hope thou in God.—Psalm 42: 5.*

Our Father in heaven and on earth, who dost love all the children of men, teach us to trust Thee and to live in good will with all our people.

Forgive those moments when we find it difficult to believe in Thee, discouraging to trust one another, and disheartening to have faith in ourselves. We are weighed down by the problems we face as a nation and by the burdens we carry day by day. So often we want to change conditions and circumstances without any thought of changing ourselves or of letting Thy spirit change us.

So we pause in Thy presence, praying that Thou wilt change us, restoring our faith in Thee, retrieving our belief in one another, and renewing our respect for ourselves.

Thus, may we live this day keeping our lives and the life of our Nation in Thy strong hands. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 270. An act to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS— PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON AND DURING THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit during general debate today and during the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcom-

mittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Ashbrook	Felghan	St. Onge
Ashley	Glaimo	Saylor
Aspinall	Goodell	Scherle
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Skubitz
Bow	Howard	Smith, N.Y.
Burleson	Kluczynski	Steed
Collier	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	McDonald,	Utt
Cowger	Mich.	Watts
Culver	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Davis, Ga.	Morse, Mass.	Winn
Diggs	Pool	Younger
Eckhardt	Rees	Zion
Evins, Tenn.	Resnick	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SIOUX INDIAN CROWNED MRS. SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, not since 1964 when a South Dakota Indian boy, Billy Mills, gained the respect and admiration of the American people by winning an Olympic Gold Medal has the proud State of South Dakota and the Sioux Indian people had so much to be proud of.

Mrs. Ramona Zephier, a fullblooded Sioux Indian from Flandreau, was crowned Mrs. South Dakota last week and is presently competing for the title of Mrs. America in San Diego, Calif.

Our State's new homemaker was born and raised on South Dakota's Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and is a graduate in home economics from my alma mater, South Dakota State University. Mrs. Zephier represents not only South Dakota but also is a tribute to the Indian people of America.

She views the title as an opportunity to "destroy some of the stereotypes of how the American Indian works and lives."

She says her goal is twofold: to show people that all Indians are not bad and to show the Indian people that whatever they want to do, they can.

For the past 10 years Mrs. South Dakota's husband, Andy, has been athletic director of the Indian school in Flandreau.

Mrs. Zephier is a versatile substitute teacher in the same school where her husband works and is the loving mother of three children.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 463

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 9240, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 666), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 9240 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution discloses, this is an open rule, providing 3 hours of debate, making in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 9240 as reported out of the Armed Services Committee, authorizing the expenditure of more than \$21 billion for pro-

curement, research, and development in connection with carrying on the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, twenty-one and a half billion dollars, in round figures, is a lot of money but yet there is a real question as to whether this authorization is sufficient for the needs of the armed services for the next fiscal year. I doubt there will be a dozen votes against this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there should be any votes against this bill, because regardless of whether we ought to be in Vietnam or not, that is now an academic question, we are there. Our boys are dying every day in ever-increasing numbers. Our planes are being shot down over there. Our materiel for the waging of war is being destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder whether the people of this country are fully aware of the real situation in which we find ourselves in this shooting war that is being waged in Vietnam today. We find that too many of our people are proceeding along their normal courses, with business as usual, making money, and not particularly concerned about how this will eventually affect them, their families, and their country.

As a matter of fact, not only the status and the prestige of our country are involved, but the very existence of our country is involved. This is no brush war. This is a real shooting war. I wish we would give more consideration to the severity and to the tragedy of the situation in which we are involved.

I said a moment ago I thought it was more or less academic whether we should or should not be there. The fact remains, I repeat, we are there.

In the humble judgment of this humble person, either we have to go in there to win this war with whatever it takes or we have to "tuck tail," as it were, and retreat.

I cannot, for the life of me, understand some of the things which are going on in this country while the boys are dying over there. I cannot understand why there seems to be a lack of the patriotic fervor which usually characterizes our people in the waging of a war.

We see our flag being burned not only in foreign countries but also in this land of the free and the home of the brave, if I may use a popular expression.

We see our public officials, including the Director of Selective Service System and other important members of the executive branch of this Government, being hooted and being picketed on many occasions, while at the same time we find certain citizens of this country going about raising the flag of discord; yes, some even blatantly and brazenly and openly appearing before the youth of this country in the various colleges of the land urging them to resist being drafted, to resist fighting for their country.

I do not profess to be a great constitutional lawyer. As a matter of fact, in the duties I have to perform around here I just have not had the time, really, to give to the study I should have liked to have given to it. But even so it is most difficult for me to understand why our

great Justice Department and why those in authority do not take some overt action to stop some of this sabotaging of our war effort.

As the information about the action that I have just described gets back over to Vietnam, it must affect some of these boys that we send over there. How can you expect them to go on the firing line, to bleed and to die for the cause for which we have sent them over there, when at the same time they read and hear about these acts of sedition and sabotage and, yes, treason in my book that are going on in this country? It is just beyond my comprehension.

Why, we have had a dozen bills or more introduced to make it a Federal offense to desecrate the flag of this country. Those bills have been pending over here in the committee, yes, in the Committee on the Judiciary for months with no action being taken on them. When certain gentlemen, high-ranking members of that committee, were before our Committee on Rules, some of us raised the question as to why they were not doing something about that. About the only answer we got was that there were State laws on the subject. I might add parenthetically here it was certainly enlightening, to say the least, to find certain people who are constantly advocating the centralization of the Government here under the dome of this Capitol suddenly becoming States righters. I believe in States rights. But here is a field that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to operate in. As a result of that action I think maybe we are going to get some action out of that committee on this particular thing.

Now, I mentioned desecration of the flag as one thing. Maybe you do not think it is too important, but again I call your attention to the fact that our boys over there in Vietnam do not feel about that flag that they are bleeding and dying for in the same way as some of the people in this country feel who would openly and brazenly set fire to that flag.

I repeat that \$21 billion plus is a lot of money, but I think I have a little reputation for being somewhat conservative around here in the spending of the taxpayers' money, and I say if this were \$221 billion and it was needed to give our boys the support they need over there, I would gladly subscribe to it and support it.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection there is grave doubt in many areas and among many Members of the Congress that \$21 billion is a sufficient amount of money to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, with the escalation of the war—and in my opinion it was appropriate that we should have the escalation—this figure in my judgment is going to be, and in the judgment of many who are more knowledgeable on the subject than I, insufficient for the fiscal year of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending over \$60 million a day just to wage this war. As I say, I do not feel that this amount is going to prove to be adequate.

Already, Mr. Speaker, we have authorized, during the 90th Congress, over \$33 billion for our cause. This includes

this legislation. Of necessity, it is going to have to be increased as we go along. My point, simply, is this: that it takes a lot of money but it takes a lot more than money to win a war.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is a feeling in some circles that the answer to crime, the answer to poverty, the answer to all questions, is spend and spend and spend more money.

This is one area in which I do not mind spending the money. But, I repeat, it takes more than the expenditure of public funds to win this war. It requires a united front. I regret to say that, apparently, we do not have the united front today.

Mr. Speaker, have we arrived at the point in this glorious young republic when a man can get up and openly defy the Government, openly advocate sedition and openly advocate treason and get by with it? And, Mr. Speaker, it is not all confined to the "Kings" and the "Car-michaels."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this bill is going to pass. I prophesy that before this Congress adjourns we will authorize and appropriate a minimum of \$10 billion more with which to carry on this war for the next fiscal year.

Give, Mr. Speaker—and this is the earnest plea of my brief appearance here—give to our boys over there not only the financial support necessary, but give to them the moral support which should naturally flow from this great country, the kind of solid support which they so much need and crave and deserve at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 463 provides for the consideration of H.R. 9240, which is the defense procurement and research authorization for 1968, with 3 hours of debate on an open rule, from the standpoint of amendments, but points of order are waived.

We had a request to waive the points of order from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services due to title III, where certain funds therein for the use of the Army can be transferred for use in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. The rule actually waives all points of order. We could have done it just for title III, but it makes no difference that we had it written in this way because there are no other points of order except title III, which must be waived.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles for the Armed Forces, and to authorize research and development programs for new weapons systems, for the fiscal year 1968.

The total of authorizations contained in the bill are \$21,435,032,000, broken down into two main categories: \$14,129,400,000 for procurement and \$7,305,632,000 for research and development.

Title I provides the following authorizations for the various types of equipment covered:

Aircraft: for the Army, \$768,700,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, \$2,420,400,000; for the Air Force, \$5,582,000,000.

Missiles: for the Army, \$769,200,000; for the Navy, \$625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, \$23,100,000; for the Air Force, \$1,343,000,000.

Naval vessel: \$1,824,000,000.

Tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, \$424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, \$5,100,000.

Title II provides the following authorization in the field of research and development of new weapons systems:

For the Army, \$1,539,000,000;

For the Navy and Marine Corps, \$1,864,118,000;

For the Air Force, \$3,288,514,000;

For defense agencies, \$464,000,000;

For the Department of Defense as a defense emergency fund for use for either research or procurement needs, \$125,000,000.

The committee added \$368,600,000 to the requests submitted by the Department of Defense—\$25,000,000 was added to the request of Department of Defense for continued work on the replacement bomber for the B-52, now designated AMSA. This brings the authorization up to what the Air Force originally asked for but was denied by the Department of Defense. The committee has also required that the two Navy frigates authorized be nuclear powered, at an additional cost of \$83,000,000, part of its continuing fight with the Department of Defense to build a modern nuclear-powered navy. Unless the President certifies otherwise, the two ships must be nuclear powered. In addition, the committee added \$106,700,000 to the authorizations for Army aircraft, chiefly helicopters, and \$188,700,000 for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

Title III provides that funds authorized for our Armed Forces can be used to support allies in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand under such terms as the Secretary of Defense may decide.

Title IV changes the manner of appointment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Four-year terms are provided for, at the pleasure of the President, and an individual could not be reappointed except in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress. These provisions would become effective on January 1, 1969.

The committee points out in its report the importance of the Nike X system and supports the Department of Defense in its request for funds to begin the change-over from research and development to production during fiscal 1968. The report discusses the various possible levels of deployment, their cost, and their effectiveness. They support the Department of Defense in its belief that each succeeding higher level of deployment could be a point of stopping or a step upward if necessary.

Congressmen PIKE and NEDZI support the bill, but not the language of the report concerning the Nike X. They do not want anything done or said which could imperil the current negotiations between the United States and Russia about the antimissile systems.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill; I urge the adoption of the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to the discussion of the resolution itself, House Resolution 463, and particularly, and as usual, to establish a legislative record and the reason for the waiver of all points of order.

It has been closely and clearly held by the gentlemen who preceded me in the well that these waivers of points of order which preempt the rights of an individual elected legislator could have applied only to title III, but there was no other point of order entertainable as to the remainder of the bill.

I did not want to interrupt the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Rules or the ranking minority member, concerning this question of points of order. I was actually so enthralled by their statements that I thought it would have been ill-timed and inappropriate to do so.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have here waived points of order against all points, and I am advised it is against title III.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, if in fact, this is waived in order to authorize a transfer of military assistance funds as stated by reference under title III, or not from the jurisdiction of one committee to the other?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HALL. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I would be glad to attempt to answer the gentleman's question, by saying it was the understanding of the committee that there were certain funds, as the gentleman has pointed out, that were authorized to be transferred—and for that reason the rule made provision for the waiving of points of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I would like to pursue it just a bit further.

Is it not true that this involved originally the military assistance fund for use in Vietnam only and that title III extends that usage to other areas in Southeast Asia?

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will yield again, and permit me to suggest that he direct his question to the very learned and very able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who is possibly—not possibly but—I am sure he is, more knowledgeable about this question than I am.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. But what I am after is the technique or the why of the waiver of points of order which is provided by the Committee on Rules in the consideration by the House of a bill like this which the gentleman himself has pointed out.

Did the request for waiver of points of order against title III or any other part of this bill come spontaneously from the Committee on Rules?

Or did it come from our parliamentarian?

Or did it come on request of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. In response to the gentleman, I would have to say my recollection of the matter is that it came from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

I might further add, which is not unusual procedure, the appropriate rule was prepared by the parliamentarian. I think perhaps that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I simply want to point out to the Members of the House that as we go into this rule limiting our prerogatives, actually this is a worthwhile rule as far as the transfer and use of these military assistance funds and other contiguous areas are concerned. I support jurisdiction and surveillance over military assistance by the Committee on Armed Services, or indeed—I support supervision of economic assistance by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

On the other hand, I want to point out and to note in the RECORD that the authority last year in the bill which became Public Law 89-367 did not have a waiver of points of order for the same purpose, nor was the question ever projected.

I doubt if it would have been this time, and I would certainly hope that we do not, by precedent or by custom, waive points of order which would eliminate the prerogatives of the individuals insofar as items of this type are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. The gentleman has said that we did not waive points of order in relation to Public Law 89-367. Of course, we did not have the provision on that bill. It was unnecessary. It was leftover money in the previously passed bill. We are now waiving points of order so the money can be used if the Secretary of Defense wants to in Thailand and Laos.

Mr. HALL. Then if the gentleman—

Mr. SMITH of California. We were requested to waive points of order. The rule was drawn up. I explained—I thought in detail—when I presented the reasons why this would have to be done

in that way. If the Secretary of Defense wants to use that money, he can use it. We are trying our best to cooperate with your committee. We did not do it out of any wishy-washy desire in the consideration of the bill in the Rules Committee.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but does he not agree with me that this also confers jurisdiction on the Committee on Armed Services from the Committee on Foreign Affairs relative to the use of Military Assistance funds, originally specifically only in the case of South Vietnam? Is it not enlarging that jurisdiction? Is that not the subject of the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], a very valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services, and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DERELICTION OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course, I wholeheartedly support the rule and support my committee in its entirety in relation to the bill which will come before the House after the rule is adopted.

I pause to pay high compliment and tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi for the remarks which he made while explaining the rule. I concur wholeheartedly in his remarks. I concur wholeheartedly in his sentiments. It is for that purpose that I have asked for the time to talk at this moment.

Yesterday I stood in the well of the House to indicate how words can be taken out of context and used for other purposes than intended. I understand that since then the practice has spread beyond the cartoonists to whom I referred yesterday in other publications, which I shall examine and, of course, have something to say about them.

But today in this particular time and in this particular instance I want to get crystal clear before the House the answer to the question on the lips of millions of American people in this country today as to why these individuals who have been described so adequately by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi who roam about the country attempting to cause disunity, defying the law and urging others to defy the law, are not brought to the bar of justice. Again I emphasize I not only speak of the Carmichaels and the Kings, whose names are in the forefront of the news, but I talk about others, particularly on the university campuses of this country.

It was my understanding before I delved into this subject that the reason that this discussion was not brought before the responsible body, the Department of Justice, was that there was no law on the books which permitted prosecution because we are not in a declared war. I am amazed, and I am sure you will be amazed to learn that the Department of Justice does not intend to prosecute these people. It has no intention at

all of bringing them to the bar of justice, regardless of what the law is, and has advised the Committee on Armed Services during the draft hearings that no law can be written to bring these people to the bar of justice.

Why? Because in the opinion of the Department of Justice, the laws which are now on the books must be looked at in connection with the application of the first amendment. As I have said and tried to describe yesterday—and did say in this discussion—nobody defends the first amendment more than I do, nobody subscribes to the first amendment more than I do, nobody understands the right of dissent more than I do. Let us not attempt to equate the right of dissent under the first amendment to disloyal acts against the law of the country as written on the statute books.

I defend the first amendment. Of course I do. But it is not that I love the first amendment less, but that I love my country more.

Let me read a part of the exchange of the colloquy in the Armed Services Committee—and I am sure the Members will be as shocked as I was when I heard this. This colloquy took place when Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., representing and speaking for the Department of Justice, was on the witness stand. This took place on Friday, May 5, 1967, at pages 875 and 876. Mr. Slatinshek, the counsel of the committee, was reading and testifying at the request of the committee.

Mr. SLATINSHEK. Section 12 of the Act relates to penalties for violation of the Draft Act, and I will read as follows:

"Sec. 12. Penalties:

"(a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged—"

Mr. BLANDFORD. Start over—"or who otherwise evades"

Mr. SLATINSHEK. I have skipped a portion of the preceding paragraph, and I pick up—

Listen well to these words. One does not have to have a baccalaureate degree, or be a long-hair, or be a doctor of philosophy, or be an egghead, but just be an ordinary common variety of citizen, such as most of us are, to understand plain English and to understand what the law says, and it says this:

or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title or of said rules, regulations or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in execution of this title, or rules, regulations or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence or otherwise with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses shall upon conviction in any District Court of the United States of competent jurisdiction be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years—

The chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], interrupted and said, "That is enough."

Continuing, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] asked this

question of the representative of the Department of Justice:

Has anybody been charged under the provision of that Act for knowingly counselling, aiding, or abetting another to refuse registration for service in the Armed Forces? Do you know of anybody who has been prosecuted under that?

This is the amazing statement from the representative of the Department of Justice. I quote Mr. Vinson:

Not within my experience, Mr. Chairman.

It is shocking—shocking—from the Department of Justice.

Let me pursue the matter further. Let me go beyond what is contained in section 12 of the Selective Service Act and read what is even more damning, by referring to the code. This is the United States Code, title 18, section 2388, under title: "Activities Affecting Armed Forces During War."

Listen well. Drink in these words to better understand the dilemma we are in and the frustration we experience:

(a) Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; or

Whoever, when the United States is at war—

I parenthetically make this statement: God knows we are at war. There are more than 10,000 dead and more than 50,000 casualties. Nobody, not even the Department of Justice, disputes the fact that we are at war.

I continue to read from the code:

willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so—

Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

(c) Whoever harbors or conceals any person who he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, has committed, or is about to commit, an offense under this section, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

(d) This section shall apply within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States. (United States Code, title 18, section 2388.)

This act was adopted June 25, 1948.

I ask the Members of the House, could anything be more clear? What do the Members think was the response of the representative of the Department of Justice when this statute was read to him? "I am not familiar with the statute."

This is the official opinion and testimony of the Department which is charged with the prosecution of the laws of this country. This is from the Department of Justice.

In the colloquy, which appeared in the RECORD of May 8, on pages 11931-33, the entire colloquy is developed as to why these people have not been prosecuted, and the Department of Justice blandly tells us that it takes unto itself the jurisdiction of judicial decision.

I frankly and readily admit that this is a practice that has become all too common. We have the Supreme Court taking unto itself the jurisdiction of writing the laws instead of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. So it is little wonder that the Department of Justice takes unto itself the functions of the judiciary. It is not hard to understand. Is there some understanding between the Justice Department and the courts as to what is right and what is wrong in judging laws? Oh, I know—and I say it with authority—that some of our Federal judges today in certain sections of the country have an open line to the Justice Department to get guidance as to what the ruling should be. Can anyone deny that a Federal judge sitting on a bench is there through the sufferance of the Justice Department and the Justice Department will not OK his appointment unless they have reason to believe that they are in line with the Justice Department's thinking. Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed?

They deny to us, the people of the United States, the prosecution of the law which they are charged with. It was in this context that I said let us forget the first amendment. I did not say "Forget the first amendment, period." It has been taken out of context that this is something I said in that way. Every time we brought up the question—and you can read it in the record—the first amendment was thrown in. If we are going to take this and carry it to its logical conclusion, there is not a law on the books, criminal or otherwise, which does not in some way, if you want to interpret it in that way, interfere with the first amendment. That is what I cannot understand. I think this is what should have been brought to bear on this. The Justice Department publicly, openly, blandly, says we are not going to prosecute because these individuals have not violated the law. I wonder if they remember when a train was stopped out in California, a military train. Yet nothing was done about it. What are we to expect from the Supreme Court?

It was interesting to note yesterday that one of the judges—I think maybe only one of two, but at least one—wanted to wipe out convictions of some demonstrators in New York, and he raised the first amendment. It was interesting to also note that his most recent wife was an attendant at the Carmichael-King demonstration in New York. What are we coming to in this country when our Justice Department tells us that they are not going to prosecute these people? I join my fellow colleague from Mississippi in saying, Yes; in my book these activities of some of these people are treason. This is disloyalty. This is beyond the

right of dissent, which I defend. I surely think these people are doing a disservice to their country when they do dissent in the fashion they do.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. I yield.

Mr. NEDZI. I am not sure I quite understood the gentleman earlier when he was referring to the statute that had in its preface the words "in time of war." I believe that the gentleman said there is no question of it. Have we officially declared war?

Mr. HÉBERT. This is not an official—

Mr. NEDZI. Will the gentleman please clarify his earlier statement?

Mr. HÉBERT. I will be very happy to repeat what I said. Regardless of whether it is a war or we have a declared war or have any language in that statute to strengthen it, the Department of Justice said it would not prosecute because the first amendment supplants it. It was in that context, which I am glad the gentleman brought up—it was in that context that I said let us forget all of these things and forget the first amendment in considering this. Let us talk about why you have not enforced the law. I said it is not your function and it is not your duty to determine what the courts are going to hold. It is your duty to prosecute that law. Also, if that law is prosecuted in the courts, remember that 12 members of a jury will decide on the facts and not the courts.

Mr. NEDZI. I agree with the gentleman, but I think the RECORD should be clear as far as the second statute that he referred to, which stated "in time of war." I do not believe anybody in the room states or adopts the philosophy that at the present time we are officially at war.

Mr. HÉBERT. No one has said that we are "officially at war," nor does it say "officially at war." It says "at war."

Mr. Speaker, do not the 10,000 dead Americans testify to the fact that we are at war, as well as the numerous thousands of American casualties testify that we are at war? If not, then I do not know what war is.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear from the hearings which we held in the committee that the question of whether we are at war or not, is academic, because there is an amendment to that law which states that the December 1950 emergency is still in effect and is pertinent to the particular case to which the gentleman from Louisiana refers. That law is in title 10 of the United States Code, section 2391.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr.

Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] yesterday, during my absence referred to the creator of an infamous cartoon, a cartoon depicting the Constitution and the participants therein.

Mr. Speaker, for want of a better word, I believe the gentleman referred to this cartoonist as a sickened man.

Mr. Speaker, I have a better word—that it is a low down, dirty trick that could only emanate and be consummated by the minds of people working for certain newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, no one has advocated the burning of the Constitution. I suspect that if anyone did recognize or would recognize the burning of the Constitution, this particular cartoonist would advocate it, because the newspaper which he represents has been burning it since I have been in Congress. There is very little left for anyone else to burn insofar as this periodical is concerned. Would the gentleman from Louisiana also remind the Members of the House as to whether or not our committee inquired of this representative of the Department of Justice whether or not any legislation could be written or whether or not any other statute was in existence—involving treason, sedition or whatever have you—that could be employed to bring these people to the bar of justice?

Mr. HÉBERT. I did inquire, as the chairman knows, with reference to this matter, and I was told, as our chairman was told and as our committee was told, that the answer was negative.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Louisiana will yield further, did not the representative of the Department of Justice state that he did not know of any way on earth whereby he could be indicted and prosecuted. They have made up their minds in the Department of Justice. They have already made the decision. They have already decided the case before the trial. They have decided the facts, and they have decided not to bring these people before the bar of justice.

Mr. Speaker, that is how simple it is. Yet, when we inquire about this—those of us who come from south of the Mason-Dixon line—they accuse us of disrespect for the Constitution, and I guess this is to be expected.

But I want to say this to you: The American people are not going to let this go on—they want this treason stopped.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I might be able to shed a little light upon the

problem as to whether the laws applicable to sending supplies and material aid to the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are effective or not, laws designed to curtail the type of activity against which the distinguished gentleman in the well speaks.

Last year I questioned the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, now the Attorney General of the United States, for perhaps an hour and a half in regard to such assistance by Vietcong sympathizers in this country and the line of questioning has been printed in the record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and is available for the Members.

The situation is this: You have two laws on the books that could possibly curtail such activity. One is the Trading With the Enemy Act, and the other is the Export-Import Control Act. The Attorney General contends that these laws are efficient and are effective, but I believe the record very clearly shows that to date there has not been a single prosecution or a single indictment obtained under those laws. I would say to the gentleman that it would be a very stupid Vietcong sympathizer indeed who would send aid to the Vietcong and be prosecuted under the present laws of the United States. He should be able to do it and still avoid prosecution in view of the present ineffective laws on the statute books. The laws simply are not effective. We do not have effective laws to curtail this type of activity and for this reason the Senate last year should have passed the so-called Pool bill notwithstanding the opposition of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HÉBERT. In addition to that, the Department of Justice says we cannot write an effective law and shows no inclination not only to write it, but to assist us in writing it. And if we write it they have no intention of prosecuting under it.

Mr. ICHORD. I would tell the gentleman that any citizen in the United States under the present law can go out and solicit money, supplies, military ammunition, or anything else to send to the Vietcong, and he will not be committing a criminal offense under the present laws.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is a sad state of affairs when this Congress cannot write such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, these people may be Americans, or they may claim to be Americans, but as for me I would rather be a dog baying at the moon than to be such an American.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this brief time to protest an abuse of the right to dissent that is taking place in the Pentagon even as I speak.

Right now, today, bearded beatniks

stationed at the entrances, inside the Pentagon, and at the ramps to the offices, are handing pamphlets out to everybody who enters, urging refusal to enlist, refusal to be drafted, refusal to go to Vietnam if you are in the service, refusal to pay income taxes, refusal to work in war industries, refusal to do any research for the Government, and encouraging acts of civil disobedience.

In all of this where is the Secretary of Defense? There is no constitutional right to undermine our Government in this way on Government property. Does the Secretary of Defense condone this action inside the very heart of the Defense Establishment while men are dying? It is worse than disgraceful. It is an abuse of the right of freedom of speech that not even the U.S. Supreme Court with its present majority would presently protect. It helps demoralize men who are fighting, and it helps the Communist cause. In time of war, declared or undeclared, such conduct on the part of American citizens is treasonable.

Yet this is not all. These pamphlets contain pictures of an American GI with a caption "Do you really want him setting fire to the homes of families, torturing prisoners, proudly counting the number of men he has killed? Do you want him playing with the children whose father or mother he may have shot that morning?"

This handout material specifically urges Americans to "follow one's conscience rather than the policies of one's government if the two conflict."

Mr. Speaker, this is the language of anarchy. Essentially the cumulative message from this material is subversive and pro-Communist. It is called "Nonviolent Direct Action for Peace," but the message seeks to destroy the fabric of law and order, and to harm the national defense effort. And whether it is a grape grown from the seeds of the grapes of wrath of licentious Supreme Court decisions or not, there is no requirement that subversion should be tolerated within our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me for this purpose, and I say again that if the Secretary of Defense did not authorize and does not condone the presence of these beatniks and these activists in the Pentagon, why have they not been ejected long ago?

I think the Secretary should act to expel them from the Pentagon and its approaches. I think that when our men are dying for America—and some of them are friends of mine the sons of friends of ours, and not long from now it may be my own boy, I think it behooves us if the Secretary does not act—we should—to stop this sort of thing. This makes a mockery of freedom of speech. This is not mere license. This is outright subversion. It is harmful to the defense effort and damaging to the national security.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9240, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will not dwell on the remarks which my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] so eloquently made. In this Committee of the Whole today, I am trying to address myself to the contents of the bill.

But prior to that, if the Chairman will permit me, I would like to say this about the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana and me concerning the attitude of the Department of Justice with respect to these people who are making a mockery of their responsibility to their Nation in time of war and who not only are giving aid and comfort to the enemy but they are chopping the hearts out of the boys who are fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I charge that people who will disseminate unfair and untruthful information in cartoons or otherwise are engaged in a conscious effort to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

My mail, Mr. Chairman, has increased over 866 percent in the 2 years since I became chairman.

We are 14 days behind in answering mail, and I have employed at least a half-dozen new employees. I get reams and reams of mail from your fighting men asking us—What is happening to America?

When a witness from the Department of Justice tells my committee "There is nothing I can do and nothing I intend to do," I say to you—What on earth has happened to your country? What on earth has happened to your country?

God help us when the highest representative of law enforcement in this country sits down and makes a statement such as this—What on earth are we to do? At least they should try to do something.

These people should be indicted. These

people should be tried, and if convicted, let them do the appealing. This is all we ask. If the Supreme Court declares that these acts, written long before these days, are unconstitutional and in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution, let that burden be upon the Supreme Court of the United States. We have done our work.

Why does not the executive branch do its? No; they elect to take another course, the course of "Do nothing, fiddle and let Rome burn."

But, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, count me out of that kind of philosophy, that kind of cowardice, that kind of inaction, and that kind of "Help" to our fighting men wherever they may be. I will not be a party to it. If there are 50 million cartoons about me and 100 million of the continually low life, dirty articles written about me and my committee in a conscious effort to destroy not only my image but that of the great committee you have elected me to run for you, I will still feel the same.

As long as you keep me as your chairman, I am going to run that committee for you—I repeat, for you. That will be my position. Nothing can be said to hurt me; nothing can be done to hurt me. I am going to keep my faith with this House, so help me God.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9240 is as important—and perhaps more important—than any authorization bill which will be presented on the floor of the House during this session of the Congress. I use the word "presented" rather than "defended" in referring to my submission of this bill for the consideration of the House, since I think you will agree that a bill of this kind—and at this time—needs no defense. The problems that face us in Vietnam and potential problems in other parts of the world constitute the best defense that the bill could have.

I would like to say that all of the departmental requests as they appeared in the program sent to the Congress have been approved by the committee with two exceptions, and I will note those exceptions at this time.

First, the Department of Defense requested two conventionally powered guided-missile destroyers; the committee has stricken those two DDG's and substituted instead two nuclear-powered guided-missile frigates. The two DDG's would cost \$166.6 million while the two DLGN's—the nuclear-powered frigates—will cost \$269.6 million.

I will deal with this matter again later in my statement.

The second difference is this: the Department of Defense requested five fast deployment logistic ships. The committee recommends two—which will make actually a total of four authorized FDL's since two were authorized and funded in fiscal year 1966. This, too, I will deal with again later in my statement.

This bill is, of course, the fiscal year 1968 authorization for appropriations for weapons procurement and research and development. It is essentially the same as many previous bills for which rules have been requested over the past several years. Some of them have been

regular fiscal year programs—as this one is—and some of them have been supplemental authorizations. This bill and all of the others have merely represented more of the same kind of thing.

The bill as presented to the committee sought authorization in the amount of \$21,066,432,000. To this request the committee added \$368.6 million for a new recommended total of \$21,435,032,000. Last year's law, incidentally, was \$17.5 billion.

In addition to describing the whole bill I will deal with each of the additions made by the committee in sufficient detail to permit understanding of the committee's action.

PROCUREMENT ARMY

First, I will briefly describe the Army program. It totals \$1,962,600,000. The procurement items for the Army are aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles. Each aircraft, missile, and tracked combat vehicle is described in detail starting on page 12 of the report. The items to be procured are essentially the same as in the past with, of course, improvements or more advanced types of weapons as these have been developed and produced.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The total Navy and Marine Corps program comes to \$5,053,800,000. This covers aircraft and missiles for the Navy and Marine Corps, tracked combat vehicles for the Marines and, of course, naval vessels.

The two biggest areas in the Navy and Marine Corps program are aircraft at about \$2.5 billion and naval vessels at almost \$1.9 billion. Both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters are to be procured as well as usual types of missiles.

A description of each of these items, from aircraft to ships, is contained in the report starting on page 20.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force program, which is the largest of the three, totals \$7,113,000,000 and represents the proposed procurement of their aircraft and missiles.

For a detailed description of these aircraft and missiles you can turn to page 27 of the report.

Let me again state that the items to be procured are essentially those that have been procured in the past for all three departments, with variances here and there which merely represent more advanced systems as they have come into being.

I would now like to deal with the additions made by the committee. You will recall that they totaled \$368.6 million which represents about a 1.2-percent increase in the whole bill. In this connection I draw your attention to the table which appears on page 2 of the report.

All but \$25 million of this amount were additions to the procurement portion of the bill. The \$25 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, I will refer to later on.

Here are the additions: First, we added EA-6A aircraft for the Marine Corps. These are needed to provide for

attrition and to replace other obsolescent electronic warfare aircraft now in Vietnam.

For the Air Force we added C-130E aircraft for the very simple reason that these outstanding cargo aircraft are needed for command support, for attrition and to fill squadrons not now fully equipped. I might mention, incidentally, that the Department of the Air Force both in the last supplemental and for this bill asked the Secretary of Defense for 50 of these aircraft. The Air Force was turned down both times. We have added only 25 of the 50.

The next aircraft is the C-7A. This is a short takeoff and landing airplane for use close in to combat areas. It can move troops, weapons, equipment and supplies rapidly within the combat zone.

Next we added some C-X2 airplanes. The designation of C-X2 does not refer to a particular airplane but rather to a type. These aircraft would be used for aeromedical evacuation and are urgently needed. The planes to be procured could be Boeing 727's, 737's, Douglas DC-9's or other aircraft of this general configuration.

At the present time our aeromedical evacuation fleet consists of old C-131's and C-118 aircraft. I think we owe a little more speed and a little bit better transportation than is now being provided our sick and wounded.

The committee also added—and this is a very high priority item—a substantial amount of authority for funds for aircraft modifications. This money would provide, for example, improved electronic equipment for fighters to give better penetration capability, greater bombing accuracy, and to provide better offensive and defensive jamming.

I want to make it clear that every one of the additions made by the committee is something requested by a military department which was turned down by the Secretary of Defense. We did not, therefore, add anything to the bill that is really "new."

The last two items that I want to talk about do not represent additions. In fact, one of them represents a deletion; these two items are the nuclear powered guided missile frigates and the fast deployment logistic ships.

Each of these has a long story connected with it. But I will be quite brief in discussing them and touch only on the highlights.

With respect to the DLGN's, you, Mr. Chairman, and the House, are aware of the long and only moderately successful fight which the Armed Services Committee has been putting up over the years to get the Department of Defense started on a nuclear surface Navy. It is completely incomprehensible to us why we have met such resistance from the Secretary of Defense. The Navy is well aware of the tremendous advantages of the nuclear powered guided missile frigates. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], both members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as well as the Armed Services Committee, know of these advantages, and I can say with complete accuracy that there is not a

single dissenting view on our committee with respect to the need for at least a start on a nuclear surface Navy.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has inserted language in the bill stating that—

The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

We have taken the bull by the horns before and authorized a DLGN which finally the Secretary of Defense has agreed to build. In this bill we have authorized two more of them—substituting them, as I have mentioned previously—for the two conventionally powered guided-missile destroyers recommended by the Department.

Simply stated, we have no other course to follow. We must continue to authorize these ships and press the Secretary of Defense to build them. We are going to continue to do exactly this.

By the way, I should note that these DLGN's are dealt with in great detail starting on page 5 of the report. Every aspect of the advantages of nuclear power in surface ships and all other pertinent matters are set out in this portion of the report.

Now let me turn to the fast deployment logistic ships. As you know, these have been the subject of a great deal of public controversy. Much of it, I think, arose from a fear on the part of the private ship owners that they would be used at some time in the future to carry cargo on a point-to-point basis thereby taking business away from the private ship owners. In actuality, they will never be used in this fashion and we have the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that this is the case.

I think virtually all of the other objections to this kind of ship have also been removed as those interested in them have become better informed as to their true military function.

Essentially the idea is this: the FDL ship would be loaded with equipment—tanks, guns, and so forth—and would be at sea—or ready to go to sea—prepared to head for a trouble spot in the world such as Vietnam was at its inception. The giant C-5 aircraft which will be coming off the line in the near future would carry the troops to the trouble spot where they would marry up with the equipment on the FDL's and form a fighting force. It's that simple.

You should understand that two of these ships were authorized in fiscal year 1966 and the Department requested five more in this 1968 program. We are recommending two of the five for an actual authorized total of four: the two from 1966 and the two in this program.

We are directing that the whole subject of these ships, functionally and otherwise, be the subject of a report to the committee by the Department of Defense early next year.

I want to draw your attention to the fact that the whole idea of the FDL ship is dealt with in detail beginning on page 8 of the report. You will find it interesting reading.

Let me now turn to "Research and development."

This is the largest defense research and development budget ever presented to the Congress, \$7.3 billion. It is \$102 million more than Congress authorized last year, including the supplemental, and \$187 million more than was appropriated.

The requests submitted by the military services were reduced within the executive branch approximately \$900 million before the budget was submitted to Congress. The Armed Services Committee adjusted only one program by adding \$25 million to the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA. You will recall that this is to be the follow-on bomber to the B-52. The Air Force is modifying the controversial TFX into an interim bomber. But the FB-111, which is the designation, will not have the unrefueled range and payload required by the Air Force. The JCS were unanimously in favor of the add-on for the AMSA in the fiscal year 1968 budget.

The Nike X antiballistic missile system is supported at the funding level requested by the Army and approved by the Department of Defense, so there is no disagreement on this program from a funding standpoint. The question is on when and where to deploy the system. Hopefully, this will be resolved upon conclusion of the negotiations presently going on with the Soviet Union. The committee strongly favors the initial deployment of the "austere" system which would provide an area defense for the entire United States against an attack from the Chinese Communists as well as an accidental firing from any other country against the United States. It would also offer protection to a number of our Minuteman ICBM missile sites. In addition, it would have the growth potential for whatever future degree of protection is desired by the Department of Defense and the Congress.

The amount included in this budget for research and development is almost \$900 million less than that requested by the military services and is intended in the words of Defense witnesses to provide "only the funds necessary to support research and development efforts where the problems are pressing, the needs clear, the approach sound, and the talent available."

We made an amendment to the bill which in no way relates to procurement and research and development but rather to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The amendment which I will describe in a moment would become effective after January 1, 1969, and will change existing law by establishing a 4-year term of appointment for the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Chief of Naval Operations.

Such persons hereafter appointed as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would serve during the pleasure of the President and could not be reappointed except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

Under existing law only the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who has coequal status with the Joint Chiefs of Staff when Marine Corps matters are

discussed, must be appointed for 4 years. The law with regard to the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Chief of Naval Operations permits appointment up to a term of 4 years. The history of the appointment and reappointments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff vary from a period of 4 years, 2 years, no term specified and, to as little as 1 year.

Under the provisions of this title a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff appointed after January 1, 1969, will know that he serves at the pleasure of the President and can be removed at any time before he completes his 4-year term. The normal tour of duty will be 4 years but each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff hereafter appointed will know that he can be removed by the President at any time and for any reason whatsoever. This proposed title in no way requires, forces, or compels the President to retain any officer as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The sole objective of the proposed title is to permit members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the Congress, as well as the President and Secretary of Defense, freely in defense matters. The final decision in defense matters must always rest with the Commander in Chief. A fixed 4-year term of office established by law will not trespass in the slightest degree upon civilian control of our Armed Forces.

I wish to strongly emphasize that the provisions of this title will not in any way affect the status of the current members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff since the effective date will be January 1, 1969.

This title also does not affect the appointment or tenure of the office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His term of appointment continues to be for 2 years and reappointment in the same manner for one additional term. In time of war declared by the Congress there is no limit on the number of reappointments for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

That is the bill. I do not feel I even need to urge your support of it because the legislation speaks for itself.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I have read the report of the committee and I note that it calls for a total expenditure of beyond \$76 billion. Certainly I have every intention of supporting the committee, as I am sure practically every Member of the House has, but I do have some misgivings with regard to the expenditure of this huge sum of money. I wonder if the committee has done anything to assure that this vast expenditure of money will be spent to win the war in Vietnam. I wonder if the chairman would care to comment on that? We hear of such things as a "no win" policy in Vietnam. I hate to see this sum of money spent and the lives of our men sacrificed unless this country is making every effort to win this war.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I do not form the policy, but every speech I make I call for a win policy. I want to win

this war. I want to bring these people to the peace table, if this is possible, and the only way we can do it is to make them hurt so they must come to the peace table.

I want to win this war, and every speech I make is to that effect.

I believe the total defense budget for fiscal year 1969 is some \$76.5 billion. This is only \$21 billion of that. That is for the hardware and research and development.

But indeed I do want to win this war, make no mistake about that.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the military authorization bill, H.R. 9240, which provides nearly 21 and a half billion dollars for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tracked vehicles, and research and development for the Department of Defense.

This amount contained in this bill is but a fraction of the \$73 billion needed for the operations of the Department this year. From 1945 through this fiscal year, the Congress has voted over \$1 trillion for the Department of Defense. One trillion dollars. This is a sum quite impossible to imagine. I am told 1 trillion miles is as far as 4 million trips to the moon. Our rate of spending has risen from \$96 billion for the 5 years from 1946 on to \$322 billion for our last 5 years.

In other words, over 3½ times since that first 5-year period following World War II.

Of course, it is true that our new weapons systems cost much more than did those of World War II. During World War II we spent \$4 million for a submarine. Today a Polaris submarine costs about \$150 million.

In World War II a destroyer cost \$7 million. Today a destroyer costs \$67 million.

During World War II an aircraft carrier cost \$55 million. The nuclear carrier *Enterprise*, without its airplanes, cost half a billion dollars.

A bomber in World War II cost approximately \$250,000. The latest version of our B-58, which we discontinued in 1962, costs \$14 million.

We have been spending at the rate of 10 percent of our military budget for research and development. So we have spent over \$100 billion since 1945 for research and development alone. One-third of this bill before us is for research and development.

In the postwar period there was a word that was used every day and was commonly understood. That word was "breakthrough." Now it is almost a stranger. We no longer hear about breakthroughs. Instead we hear about studies.

With the amounts of money we have been continuing to spend on our research and development—and this year, as I have indicated, it is over \$7 billion—we would expect that we would be reaching as many breakthroughs now as we did in the past. Indeed we would even expect them to be more frequently because of

the spending we are doing, but that is not so.

During the period of World War II and immediately thereafter we saw the successful development of radar and sonar, of the ballistic missile and the Polaris submarine, of nuclear weapons and transistors in miniature form. This same feeling of accomplishment has been missing lately.

It might be thought that during the earlier years there was an abundance of advanced ideas which no one had enough money fully to develop. So these were available for quick development as soon as we had the money and applied our talents. We hope this same situation prevails today, but unfortunately the entire psychology of our military development appears to lack the excitement, the determination, and the urgency which characterized our military developments in the earlier postwar periods.

A new thinking has come among us which should suggest that we take comfort in the status quo, that we have reached the highest peaks of military development necessary for our national defense. That is shown by the statement in the report of the Presidential Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, which said:

As the production of strategic weapons brings us close to our needed strength, the demands of defense on our scientific and technical resources are leveling out.

This feeling that we have reached the plateau of accomplishments is also reflected in the fact that our scientists are not as eager now as they were to participate in research in our defense efforts. A recent article in *Science* discussed this problem under the title "Military Research: A Decline in the Interest of Scientists?"

In recent years we have been put in the position where our choices have been limited. For instance, we are now phasing out the B-52 bombers for the less advantageous FB-111. The choices available are not the best that this country can procure or that industry can provide because of the postponement of decisions which the distinguished chairman of this committee has mentioned on many occasions.

In our earlier period of research we had a number of developments from which we could make the decision to move ahead. We do not now. We should be advancing now at great speed on the AMSA, but now it is necessary for us to have an interim airplane, an expensive one, with limited capabilities, called the FB-111.

While there is no one whose desire for peace is greater than mine, I sometimes feel that the moving force of someone in the decisionmaking process is to go toward equality of armaments with our potential enemies and to relax our efforts more than the security of our country really permits.

I could not take issue with some of these decisions if there were a solid inspection system under which we could with safety deescalate our development of greater military weapons systems. This is certainly an ideal worthy of our most meticulous and careful examina-

tion. Even more, such consideration is crucial in this dangerous world in which we live.

But I would also suggest that there is nothing more dangerous than idealism in a vacuum. Until sound agreements are reached, the peace we seek is but an illusion if we do not develop our military strength to see to it that we always have superior power. We must always have the technological superiority so that we are the ones to have the "ace in the hole." We were caught short on October 4, 1957, regardless of the reasons, and it must never happen again. What if Sputnik had been a new weapon system of corresponding significance? We must have the best defenses. We can maintain the peace—our freedoms and our way of life—only if the potential enemy knows we have the power of great destruction.

We had that advantage at the end of World War II. Our development of atomic power has given us such an amount of destruction in one B-52 that one million B-52's would be needed to match that if the load were TNT.

For our best military offense we must have a series of weapons systems carefully planned, proven, and developed. These would force our potential enemy to develop defenses against each such system.

We must be careful in the development of any jack-of-all-trades system that military degradation is not the result. Thus in producing a single fighter for the Air Force and the Navy, the Navy fighter had such setbacks that its ability to fly off a carrier deck and perform its missions has suffered greatly. While commonality is an attractive word, we should not permit it to result in a compromised weapon that cannot compete with an enemy who decided that a compromise was not good enough.

There are those who believe that our missile systems are sufficient to deter the aggressor from ever striking. I believe to the contrary. There is a centuries old adage "Never put all of your eggs in one basket." In the latter part of the 20th century, this should be a clarion call to us to avoid the trap that history teaches so graphically in that expression. While it is expensive for us to have alternative offensive systems, it is also expensive to the other side to develop defenses to cope with our systems. It is for this reason that I have so strongly supported the further development of the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft—and that our committee has added \$25 million to the President's budget for this program. This sum is to carry on the development of the engines and avionics for the plane.

The missiles and the bombers fall within the first category of our weapons systems called by the Pentagon our deterrent forces. The second great group of forces is supposed to be our damage limiting forces. Yet the best known damage limiting force that we have to date—our antiballistic missile system—is still not in production and is still only in the advanced study phase. Even the funds the Congress added last year for the preproduction activities have been deferred and have not been allowed to be spent. In the meantime, our potential enemies have

started the installation of one, and perhaps even two, such systems.

One of the main items to which our committee has addressed itself over the past years has been the development of the nuclear navy. To us this seems logical and sensible, but the development is a long time in coming.

Although the aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, has been in operation now for a number of years, it was not until last year that the Department of Defense decided to build another nuclear-powered carrier—letting two other carriers be conventionally powered in the meantime. This year the Department added the funds needed for the long leadtime items for a third nuclear-powered carrier. Now we are trying to get the escorts for these nuclear carriers to be nuclear powered also so that we can have entire task forces independent of the propulsion fuel supply. It was only after we put mandatory language in last year's bill that the Defense Department allowed the Navy to have a third nuclear-powered guided missile frigate to add to the *Bainbridge* which has been in commission and operating in Southeast Asia, and the *Truxtun* which is just being commissioned. We have also the nuclear-powered cruiser the *Long Beach* as the only other nuclear-powered surface ship. The change is still too slow.

It took two-thirds of a century to convert our Navy from sails to steam. Coal was more expensive and its use posed many problems. As the sails were eliminated each coal-fired ship had to have a collier attend it when it had extended periods of operation at sea. So the operation today is much easier than it was in the days gone by. With the change to nuclear power, it will no longer be necessary to provide tankers alongside the carriers or its escorts for their propulsion fuel, thus cutting a great logistics train. Indeed, as the Chief of Naval Operations has told our committee:

Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam.

At the present each nuclear ship receives a supply of nuclear fuel when it is built that lets it operate for 10 years without refueling. The time is not too far away when the life of the initial loading of fuel will be the same as the life of the ship. The first core loading will provide enough energy to satisfy all requirements for the lifetime of the vessel.

Now is the time to have all major fleet escorts nuclear powered. This is the position of this committee, as it has been the position of all other committees which have considered the matter. It is inconceivable that in 1967 we should be building any ship which will still be available in the year 2000 and have a fuel system that was first introduced 100 years before. Yet that is what will be happening if we do not insist on having the major fleet escorts nuclear. Last year the Chief of Naval Operations expressed it this way:

Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade ef-

fectiveness with grave implications for national security.

Admiral Rickover has provided the committee with copies of letters he has received from the commanding officers of our nuclear surface ships in operation, and especially in operation in Southeast Asia. These show that our nuclear ships are capable of continued high speed operation on a moment's notice that is impossible with conventionally powered ships. They can be sent on special missions on a moment's notice without having to top off with black oil. They are far cleaner and do not require the man-hours for maintenance that our fuel-burning ships do.

However, instead of making the judgment on the basis of experience, the Department of Defense is going through two more studies. Nuclear power has been so studied to death that there has been nothing but delay. Our committee has in the past year received studies of nuclear power over a foot thick. Strangely enough when I asked for the studies on which the Department asked for the construction of gas turbine-powered ships, they produced one seven-page study and one 1-inch study. Neither study considered nuclear power.

The main difficulty with the studies is that they are based on numerical calculations set up by the systems analysis people. Yet these studies do not take into consideration the vital elements of experience, such as the effect of finally cutting the propulsion fuel pipeline. It was most shocking to find that while the Chief of Naval Operations believes he could conduct a mission with less loss of American lives if he had an all nuclear task force, that decrease in the loss of lives is never included in any of the studies since it cannot be expressed as a number with which the systems analysis people are familiar.

As of this moment, there are two more studies being conducted—one the major fleet escort study, the other the DX/DXG study. It is the committee position that the time has long since passed when further money should be spent on studying major fleet escorts which are not nuclear powered, and it has taken that position in its report.

Again this year, as in years past, the committee has drawn attention to the fact that the fleet is becoming obsolescent at a much faster rate than it is being rebuilt. This year we point out that if the fleet were to remain at its expected strength with usable ships in 1973, the Navy would have to build new ships at the rate of over 140 ships a year for the next 3 years.

This year, as in the past, there is a considerable sum of money included in the budget for antisubmarine warfare operations.

As we have learned from Vietnam, the enemy likes to use guerrilla tactics. This will probably also be true in his use of submarines. The murky depths of the oceans can hide a submarine—especially a nuclear submarine that never needs to surface for air. The game can be very deadly. The fleet of submarines which is available against us is growing—and al-

ready has over 400, including over 50 with nuclear propulsion.

Our committee has been concerned about the progress being made in our antisubmarine warfare programs. It has been concerned enough to set up a special subcommittee for this. It appears that our fears in this regard have been well founded. In the past year, the Department of Defense has decided to cut back the construction of new nuclear attack submarines—the weapons which have been described as our primary antisubmarine weapons. It has also been announced that the number of hunter-killer groups, which have already been reduced from nine to eight, will be further reduced to six in the near future. In the meantime, the Department of Defense is running a number of studies to see whether the aircraft carrier for this group is needed—and to plan the type of plane which should go on the carrier if it is continued. Unfortunately, what has not been made clear so far is that there are very few if any carriers presently in use in our antisubmarine warfare groups from which the newly planned plane—the VSSX—can fly.

The tendency in the Department of Defense is to replace carrier-based aircraft with land-based aircraft—and this at a time when our ability to have land bases around the world is becoming increasingly questionable.

Indeed an examination of the study on which the Department of Defense concluded to take some of these actions discloses that the study not only specifically disclaims being the base for making force levels decisions, but the study is so poorly put together that it is not a proper basis for any decision. The conditions on which the study was based are so contrary to fact and the deductions from those conditions so far from the present day world that the study is worse than no good—it is dangerously misleading. The "scenario" on which the study was based is in fact a "dream" which upon examination in the cold light of day makes the study more nearly a "nightmare."

NUCLEAR NAVY: THE POINT AT ISSUE

The point at issue is whether an aircraft carrier that is nuclear powered, and hence cut free from the logistics supply line for its own propulsion, should be accompanied by four or more escorts, any of which are tied to the logistics pipeline for their own fuel. Our committee believes, in line with the studies made by Admiral Rickover, that the real military effectiveness of such a task group is not fully realized until the last escort is freed from the fuel oil pipeline.

NUCLEAR ESCORTS

Last year in its report, this committee set forth the basic issue as:

THE ISSUE

The issue before Congress is very simple—do we start now to have all-nuclear task forces?

The attack carrier

The attack aircraft carrier is our prime naval attack weapon. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. With the British decision not to defend east of Suez,

the French decision to pull out of NATO and to have all foreign troops withdrawn from French soil, and with the increasing problems with rights of overflight, we must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere.

Nuclear-powered attack carrier

The nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier has proven so far more effective in battle than the Department of Defense has requested one new nuclear-powered carrier this year at a cost of \$427.5 million and is planning for other new nuclear carriers. The nuclear carrier has a complement of about 6,000 officers and men. With its air wing of about 100 planes, its initial total capital cost is about \$1 billion.

Escort ships

At least four escort ships are assigned to each aircraft carrier to protect it against any air or submarine attack. The initial capital cost of the four escort ships is about \$500 million if they are nuclear powered and \$300 million if they are conventionally powered; however, the cost of the nuclear-powered ships includes the first cores which provide power for at least 10 years and also extra armament. The cost of conventionally powered ships does not include the cost of fuel or fuel delivery. When all costs are considered the difference in building and operating a nuclear-powered task force over a conventionally powered task force with the same type ships is only about 6 percent over their entire lifetime.

Soviet submarines

As reported in the newspapers, the Soviets now have about 45 nuclear submarines which have unlimited attack range and are building more. Only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase for refueling.

Conventional power

Substituting conventionally powered escorts for nuclear-powered escorts does not in any way meet the problem of protecting the attack aircraft carrier against the unlimited attack range of a nuclear-powered submarine. Nor do they provide the continuous screen for the carrier.

It is foolhardy not to provide the best protection for the 6,000 man crew and the initial \$1 billion unit capital investment in a nuclear-powered carrier by not spending the additional 4 percent to make the entire task force nuclear powered.

Black oil logistics

A nuclear-powered task force that is free of the black oil logistics train can travel anywhere around the world on a moment's notice without refueling and can arrive ready for immediate operations. This freedom from the logistics train for black oil can be followed by new methods of replenishing ammunition and food so that the task force is less and less dependent on any logistics train. This possibility can open up new tactics which are flexible to meet peculiarities of any individual situation. As the Chief of Naval Operations stated in his memorandum of April 14, 1966, to the Secretary of the Navy:

"The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequalled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

Nothing has happened to make this committee change its mind on this position. On the contrary, the committee is more convinced than ever that nuclear-

powered aircraft carriers need to have nuclear-powered escorts in order to make the task group have the highest military effectiveness possible. To this end, the committee is recommending this year the additional funds needed for the completion of the nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate partially funded last year together with the funds necessary for the construction of another nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. The Navy requested two DDG's—conventional guided-missile destroyers—and one DLGN—nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. The Secretary of Defense eliminated the nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate, leaving only the two conventional guided-missile destroyers.

By this action, the committee is recommending an increase of only \$83 million over the program of the Secretary of Defense while at the same time assuring that our nuclear-powered aircraft carriers are receiving the most militarily effective escorts it is possible to provide.

The figures are:

[In millions]	
2 DLGN, at \$134.8 million (follow ship cost, which includes \$12 million per ship for initial nuclear fuel that will power at least 10 years of normal ship operation)-----	\$269.6
Less advanced procurement previously authorized (fiscal year 1967)-----	20.0
Subtotal-----	249.6
Less 2 DDG (lead ship cost \$99.7 million, follow ship cost \$66.9 million) included in fiscal year 1968 budget request-----	166.6
Additionally required in fiscal year 1968-----	83.0

The committee cannot fail to point out to the Congress that it was only after the Congress inserted strong language in the authorization bill last year that the Secretary of Defense proceeded with the one nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. That language is:

The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89-37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.

As a result of this position, the Congress in 1966 authorized and appropriated \$130.5 million to complete the funding for the one nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate for which \$20 million for the procurement of long leadtime items had been authorized and appropriated in 1965. The Congress also authorized and appropriated \$20 million for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate.

Of these, the Department of Defense has allowed only the first of these two guided-missile frigates to be constructed.

Last year in its hearings, this committee published a paper by Rear Adm. Henry L. Miller, then commander, Carrier Division 3, on the advantages of nuclear power in a combat environment. This paper was extensively quoted in last

year's report. This year, upon the urging of the committee, several letters were introduced from the commanding officers of nuclear-powered surface ships showing how the nuclear power greatly facilitated their operations. While there are deletions for security purposes in the letters, the balance is inserted in the RECORD for the clear proof of the advantages of nuclear power.

One letter was from the commanding officer of the *Enterprise*:

Of particular interest at this time is the issue of nuclear propulsion in escort ships for the attack carrier strike forces. I think you would be interested in the experience of the *Enterprise* and her escorts, both nuclear and conventionally powered, during actual fleet operations. One incident in particular serves as a forceful example of the military advantages which are gained when the nuclear propelled carrier's escorts are also nuclear powered.

At the completion of the recent deployment to the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Western Pacific, the USS *Enterprise* was scheduled to return to her home port of Alameda, Calif., [deleted] in company with the nuclear powered frigate USS *Bainbridge*, and four oil burning destroyers. . . . The four conventionally powered ships were to utilize all of the *Enterprise's* [deleted] gallon capacity of NSFO. . . .

Now, do not forget, by having to carry black oil for escorts, she is required to carry less aviation fuel. That is, if she had all nuclear escorts, she would not have to carry the black oil and could use these tanks for more aircraft fuel.

Captain Holloway's letter goes on:

In the first stage of planning, it was evident that even with a conservative SOA of [deleted] knots, using all available measures to conserve fuel, the oil burning destroyers would arrive in their home ports in the United States with less than [deleted] fuel remaining. This figure included no reserve for storm evasion, prosecution of unidentified contacts, search and rescue operations, or any of the myriad of other fuel consuming contingencies which could be expected on a Pacific crossing. This situation was reported . . . and an oiler was requested to refuel the force in the vicinity of the Hawaiian Islands. However, no Navy oilers were available for this task at the time required.

On this transit, the task group was considered to be vulnerable to overflights from USSR long range reconnaissance aircraft. To take advantage of the air search radars on the destroyers and attain the early warning considered necessary for the interception and identification of suspicious air contacts, it had been originally planned to station the destroyers in a widely dispersed AAW disposition with pickets deployed in the sectors from which the approach of USSR reconnaissance aircraft was most probable.

The very tight fuel situation of the conventional destroyers and the additional travel required of these ships steaming from their disposition station to the *Enterprise* for refueling, made the employment of the optimum AAW disposition impossible. Instead, it was necessary to station the conventional ships in close to the carrier in an ASW type screen (despite the fact that the threat was from the air and not sub-surface) in order to attain the fuel economy necessary to accomplish the transit.

As the events actually occurred, the *Enterprise* departed WESTPAC one week early on a sudden change of plans, leaving [deleted] [deleted] and accompanied only by the USS *Bainbridge*.

To gain the greatest advantage of the early warning radar capability of a single ship, the

Bainbridge was stationed [deleted] miles from the *Enterprise* on a [deleted] bearing, the general direction of [deleted] the most probable direction from which Russian reconnaissance aircraft could be expected to approach the force.

Overflights occurred on the transit to CONUS. . . . Of significance here, the USSR aircraft approached the *Enterprise* from [deleted] [deleted]. Whether the track of the Russian aircraft which approached the carrier from [deleted] was deliberately evasive or the result of a search pattern is not known nor is it important. The significant fact is that a [deleted] was inadequate to provide early detection of the long range reconnaissance aircraft. In this particular case, it is believed that [deleted] pickets, properly disposed [deleted] [deleted] would have extended the radar coverage to detect this particular mission. Under other circumstances, in other geographic locations where the expected directions of approach may cover a 360 degree arc, a minimum of [deleted] pickets may be required.

To keep the record clear, I must add however, [deleted] and missile armed F4 Phantom fighters were launched in time to intercept the Russian search aircraft well away from the force, and escort them continuously in the vicinity of the *Enterprise*.

I think that the experience of the *Enterprise* points up several important facts:

(1) Conventionally powered escorts demand a considerable quantity of fuel even when conducting an unopposed transit at economical speeds.

(2) Oilers are not necessarily available when needed.

(3) Conventional escorts low on fuel can actually constitute a detriment to the mobility and tactical freedom of a nuclear powered carrier.

(4) [Deleted.]

I feel that these events should hold a special interest for you because they represent real happenings in an actual situation, as opposed to parameters in a scenario based study.

One letter from the captain of the *Bainbridge* said:

[Deleted] escorts (frigate or destroyer) are normally assigned to *Enterprise* to provide AAW and ASW protection, plane guard services, and electronics backup. During flight operations, *Enterprise* requires [deleted]. The screen commander's schedule calls for rotating the plane guard duties in order to release the [deleted] escort for individual ship exercises during the day. However, thus far, this rotation has not worked out in practice. *Enterprise* has been launching and recovering at speeds of [deleted] knots 80% of the time because of the very light winds encountered the past ten days. When high speeds are necessary for flight operations, she must also run down wind at [deleted] knots in order to remain in her assigned area. As a result, *Bainbridge* has been assigned primary night plane guard every night because we can remain on station during these high speed operations. The conventionally powered escort has not been so assigned because it would mean going to [deleted] boiler operation, with concomitant increased fuel consumption and watch requirements (engineering personnel go to watch and watch for [deleted] boiler operation). In order to be in proper position to assume night plane guard duties, we must also remain in the immediate vicinity of *Enterprise* during the day. For a conventionally powered escort to carry out the assignment properly when the winds are light, it would mean [deleted] boiler operation on a 24 hours basis. In addition to plane guard duties, *Bainbridge* was assigned the [deleted] guard for the task group during a [deleted] hour period when *Enterprise* [deleted] was down. This involved maintaining station

[deleted] of *Enterprise* during a period when *Enterprise* was steaming at speeds of [deleted] knots conducting flight operations.

During the seven day period *Gridley* operated with us she refueled [deleted] times from an AOE/AO. At no time did she go to boiler operation. [Deleted.]

Another letter from the captain of the *Bainbridge* said:

We are scheduled to enter [deleted] this afternoon; that is, if Typhoon Sally [deleted] does not require us to divert. When word was received yesterday, [deleted] that a typhoon was in the area and heading West, the Task Group was slowed to [deleted] knots for 2 hours and *Enterprise* refueled to maximum capacity the [deleted] conventionally powered escorts who, along with *Bainbridge*, comprise the screen unit. There was no oiler with the task group or in the vicinity. During this two hour period, *Enterprise* was without the protective services of [deleted] ASW screen ships, because while [deleted], *Bainbridge*, not requiring fuel to be ready for typhoon evasion measures, took station in the van and screened for submarines. However, effective sonar coverage in the direction of movement was reduced by [deleted] and on the spot ASW weapons availability was reduced at the very minimum by [deleted]. The [deleted] weapons availability assumes optimistically that the lifeguard escort could leave station astern, gain sonar contact, solve the fire control problem and launch a long range ASW weapon, e.g., ASROC—all within a matter of minutes. In addition to the degradation in sonar coverage and quick-reaction weapon availability, slowing the task group to [deleted] knots for two hours greatly increases the vulnerability of all ships to enemy submarine attack. The prime defense against attack by nuclear powered submarines is high speed, but even in the case of a conventional submarine, a reduction in the speed of the task group widens the "limiting lines of submerged approach" and quickly changes an impossible or unfavorable submarine attack position into an entirely feasible or favorable one.

[Deleted.]

This is just one specific and actual example of the degradation in readiness posture which results from underway refueling. Unfortunately, because the fleet is dependent upon frequent refueling, this situation occurs at least every three days in a task group, and then at times not even of our choosing, and we must be ready to react quickly to any contingency which may arise. The fleet, of course, has lived with this situation so long that the reduction in readiness is accepted as inevitable. It is automatically a part of our planning, thinking, and decision-making. We have developed underway refueling to a fine art, with increased pumping rates, reduced alongside times, and more efficient deck rigs. But the fact remains that to perform the evolution, the task group must slow and ships must leave their screening stations to take station alongside, and in effect, the task group becomes a "sitting duck" for attack by enemy submarines. With nuclear powered surface ships, particularly escorts, we do not have to live with this problem forever.

There was still another letter from the captain of a nuclear attack submarine which had been assigned to attack an aircraft carrier during fleet exercise. The letter has been classified in its entirety, but its lesson is as Admiral Rickover stated in our hearings:

Here is an excerpt from a letter dated 10 March 1967 I received from the Commanding Officer of a nuclear attack submarine. This letter brings out the reduced vulnerability to submarine attack of nuclear warships gained

by eliminating the need to run at slow speeds to conserve fuel or to refuel.

RICKOVER MEMORANDUM

While the letters quoted above show that nuclear power in the real world has many advantages over conventional power, there have been two studies which also show these advantages. The first was by Admiral McDonald and was published in this committee's hearings of last year. The more recent one is of February 3, 1967, and was by Admiral Rickover. Its main features are:

For sustained operations, a CVAN68 task group with five gas turbine driven escorts will require between 1.2 and 4.2 times as much aircraft fuel (JP-5) for escort propulsion as is required for aircraft propulsion, the ratio of escort to aircraft fuel depending on the tempo of air operations and on the distance to the replenishment area. The results of this study . . . show that each nuclear escort substituted for a conventional escort significantly improves the military effectiveness of the overall nuclear carrier task group. The incremental gain in military effectiveness is larger as each nuclear escort is substituted, with the largest increment being added when the all-nuclear task group is achieved. The CVAN68 with all nuclear escorts will have the capability to steam at high speed to any ocean area in the world and carry out more than [deleted] days of combat operations, delivering a sustained average of [deleted] short tons of aircraft ordnance per day—an ordnance delivery rate [deleted] greater than that ever achieved by any aircraft carrier to date—all without mobile logistic support.

A nuclear carrier task group with five conventional escorts will require much more fuel for the escorts than is required for aircraft. An advantage of nuclear power in the escorts is the elimination of the requirement to deliver ships' fuel to the force which greatly simplifies logistic problems, reduces the number and frequency of task group replenishments, increases response range of the task group, improves effectiveness of the escort screen, and reduces vulnerability of the task group. This could also increase the overall percentage of time spent on the line, depending on how far and how frequently the force must retire for replenishment. As the Chief of Naval Operations stressed in his memorandum to you [Secretary of the Navy] of 14 April 1966 concerning nuclear power for surface warships, the improvements which nuclear propulsion provides in readiness, response, mobility, tactical flexibility, and survivability—all derived from being independent of propulsion fuel logistic support—are important in all circumstances and could be decisive in many situations.

. . . the CVAN68 will be able to operate at much greater ranges from sources of replenishment and still require much less replenishment when she has nuclear escorts than when she has conventional escorts. For example, for the same percent time on the line with the same amount of ordnance dropped, the CVAN68 with a screen of all nuclear escorts, compared to the CVAN68 with a screen of five conventional escorts, depending on the tempo of air operations and the distance to the replenishment area:

- a. [Deleted.]
- b. [Deleted.]
- c. [Deleted.]

"d. In addition to the reduction in the amount of fuel to be delivered and the reduction in the number and frequency of replenishments, these in turn will allow the all-nuclear task group, with one replenishment group, to conduct the same sustained operations [deleted] times as far from an advanced base.

The number of AAW missile batteries, the number of sonars and ASW weapons systems, and the number of escorts needed to

protect the great investment in a CVAN cannot properly or logically be traded off for nuclear propulsion. No matter how many tradeoffs we study of other ways to spend the money we need to pay for nuclear propulsion, we will always be faced with comparing unlike things; none of the tradeoffs accord freedom from logistic support for propulsion fuel which is provided by nuclear propulsion. The other tradeoffs provide additional defensive protection to the CVAN, but none of them increase the offensive capability of the CVAN as well—as does nuclear propulsion in the escorts. To compare a larger number of conventional escorts with a smaller number of nuclear escorts at equal cost is not to compare alternate ways of achieving the same capability; it is merely to compare two different capabilities that can be achieved with the same amount of money.

I consider that nuclear propulsion should be judged on its own merits; for those ship types where the increased military effectiveness is worth the higher cost we should spend the dollars necessary to provide nuclear propulsion—we should not sacrifice some other needed military capability to provide these dollars. Since nuclear propulsion in the escorts for a CVAN improves the military effectiveness of the nuclear carrier task group as a whole, the increased cost of the task group as a whole is likewise the cost factor which should be considered. In this regard, the cost of providing nuclear propulsion in a nuclear carrier escort increases the carrier task group system overall cost only about one percent.

I consider the information presented in this memorandum and enclosure (1) clearly establishes the superior cost-effectiveness of all nuclear escorts for nuclear carriers. If we are to continue to develop the Navy's nuclear propulsion capability, it is essential that we continue to build nuclear ships. Further, the only way we can hope to make any appreciable reduction in the cost of nuclear escorts is to build a significant number of them. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Navy adopt the policy of providing all nuclear escorts for our nuclear aircraft carriers, and seek the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the Congress for this policy.

The Navy needs [deleted] new nuclear powered guided missile escorts in addition to the *Long Beach*, *Bainbridge*, *Truxtun*, and the fiscal year 1967 DLGN (DLGN36), in order to provide a minimum of four nuclear escorts for the *Enterprise*, CAVN68, and the [deleted] nuclear carriers approved by the Secretary of Defense in the fiscal year [deleted] shipbuilding programs. [Deleted] more nuclear escorts will be needed for the [deleted]. Thus the Navy needs [deleted] new nuclear powered guided missile escorts in addition to the DLGN36 to accompany the nuclear carriers planned by the Navy through the fiscal year [deleted] program.

Building [deleted] CVANs and [deleted] nuclear escorts through the fiscal year [deleted] program would provide a reasonable rate of introduction of nuclear propulsion into the surface striking forces. By the late 1970s the Navy would then have [deleted] of its carrier striking forces with nuclear propulsion. This would provide a solid base of experience from which to determine the future rate at which the Navy should adopt nuclear propulsion and the ultimate extent nuclear propulsion will prove feasible and desirable in the Navy.

The nuclear surface warship building program I propose is within the capacity of the nuclear and shipbuilding industries and within the capability of the Navy to train the personnel to man the ships. It will serve as a practical approach to bringing the advantages of nuclear propulsion to the Navy at a reasonable rate and will serve as a

stimulus to the further advancement of the state of the art.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY'S OBJECTIONS

When this report was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, he wrote a two-page letter of March 1, objecting strongly to it.

The first objection was that—

Admiral Rickover's paper makes use of "Time on the Line Before Retiring for Replenishment" as a primary index of merit. It seems to me that this index of merit would be meaningful only if the force could not be replenished, or if we do not plan to engage in sustained operations.

But this objection is not valid. By April 17, the Secretary of the Navy had given Admiral Rickover a letter to read before the committee in which the Secretary himself said:

The addition of one or more nuclear powered escorts to a carrier task force (nuclear or non-nuclear) does increase its military capability. For example, it can increase the time interval between replenishments.

The Chief of Naval Operations answered the question:

Is increased time on the line before having to retire for replenishment made possible by providing nuclear powered escorts for a nuclear powered carrier a meaningful indicator of increased military effectiveness?

By stating:

Generally, yes. It is of course possible to postulate conditions where the increased potential might not have to be used.

There were other assumptions which the Secretary of the Navy tried to attack. Yet the Rickover memorandum had had its assumptions approved by the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations. Indeed, in response to a question, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

The assumptions in the memorandum of 3 February 1967 are considered to be valid and I agree with them.

Indeed, in his forwarding memorandum of February 20, 1967, to the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

The memorandum concludes that all CVAN escorts should be nuclear powered, based on lifetime costs and military effectiveness. From the operational viewpoint, I would support this conclusion. * * * The basic memorandum adds emphasis to our need to expedite implementation of the Navy's previously recommended program of at least two nuclear powered escorts per CVAN.

Part of the reasoning of the Secretary of the Navy is based on the belief that there would be one DLGN to be substituted for two DDG's. In stating this, the Secretary of the Navy is not stating the facts correctly. Last year the Congress completed the authorization and appropriation for one DLGN and started the funds for a second, urging the Department of Defense to request yet another DLGN this year. In taking the action that it is doing this year, the committee is adding two DLGN's over the number requested by the Department of Defense by completing the funding for the second DLGN and providing a third DLGN. Thus, it is providing two DLGN's that the Navy does not yet have in place of

the two DDG's that the Navy requested this year along with the one DLGN that it sought, but which the Secretary of Defense turned down.

POSITION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The position of the Secretary of Defense is set forth in his annual posture statement:

Last year Congress added funds to our original budget request for construction of a nuclear-powered frigate. As you know, we did not recommend the inclusion of such a ship in our FY 1967 program. However, we have decided to proceed with construction this year, building it ahead of the time it will actually be needed to support the plan for one high speed nuclear-powered escort (three DLGN's and one CGN) for each of the four planned nuclear-powered carriers. (The fourth nuclear-powered carrier is scheduled not to be started for several years.)

This position is directly contrary to the position he took last year when he appeared before this committee. At that time he said:

There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for * * *. As I say, I believe we have. If we haven't, I'm quite prepared to change the programs.

This committee has asked for a long time to receive the systems analysis studies on which the Department of Defense decisions are based. The Secretary of Defense has developed a reputation for making his decisions on the basis of these studies. Yet to this day, not one of the famed Department of Defense systems analysis studies has been made available to this committee.

In response to the latest request from this committee, the Secretary of Defense wrote that—

On March 1, I received a paper prepared by Admiral Rickover on the subject of nuclear powered escorts for nuclear aircraft carriers and I understand that the Navy will forward a copy of this memorandum to you.

The Navy will also be forwarding to you a memorandum from the Secretary of the Navy to the Chief of Naval Operations commenting on Admiral Rickover's study. The Secretary points out that the figure of merit proposed by Admiral Rickover would be meaningful only under unrealistic assumptions. His letter also brings out the fact that Admiral Rickover's analysis rests on several very questionable assumptions. Further analysis is required.

MILITARY VIEWS

The best answer that I can make to the objections of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy to the memorandum by Admiral Rickover is found in the questions put to the Chief of Naval Operations and his answers thereto:

QUESTION

1. Were the assumptions in the memorandum from Admiral Rickover to you of 3 February 1967 agreed upon by the Naval Ship Engineering Center of the Naval Ship Systems Command and representatives of the Strike Warfare Division and of the System Analysis Group of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, or taken from assumptions used in earlier Navy studies?

ANSWER

1. The assumptions contained in pages 14-18 of enclosure (1) to the memorandum from Admiral Rickover to me of 3 February 1967 regarding Aircraft Ordnance and Aircraft Fuel Usage Rates were agreed upon by representatives of Naval Ship Systems Command, and the Strike Warfare Division and Systems Analysis Group of my office. Other assumptions such as on-the-line escort speed profile and fuel and ordnance reserves have been included in earlier Navy studies (NAVWAG 33 and my memo of 14 April 1966 on nuclear power for surface warships).

QUESTION

2. Are any of the assumptions in the memorandum of Admiral Rickover questionable in your opinion? If they are questionable, please set forth exactly how they are questionable, what you believe they should be, and the basis for your opinion. If you agree with his assumptions, would you please state so? Would you do the same for the Admiral's response to the SECNAV memorandum of March 1, 1967?

ANSWER

2. The assumptions in the memorandum of 3 February 1967 are considered to be valid and I agree with them. The comments contained in Admiral Rickover's 9 March response to the SECNAV memorandum of 1 March have been reviewed. I do not desire to constrain the groups studying Major Fleet Escort requirements or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation by judging at this time that all DXG or other Major Fleet Escorts of the future should be nuclear. I do feel, however, that good and sufficient operational reasons exist to program more nuclear-powered escorts than are presently programmed.

QUESTION

3. Is increased time on the line before having to retire for replenishment made possible by providing nuclear-powered escorts for a nuclear-powered carrier a meaningful indicator of increased military effectiveness?

ANSWER

3. Generally, yes. It is of course possible to postulate conditions where the increased potential might not have to be used.

QUESTION

4. Assuming replenishment can be carried out on the line, won't there still be an increased time between replenishments for a group with nuclear-powered escorts as compared to a group consisting only of conventionally-powered escorts or of gas turbine-powered escorts?

ANSWER

4. Generally, yes. Exceptional cases may occur.

QUESTION

5. Are there other aspects to the military effectiveness of nuclear power which should be considered in making this kind of decision? How are they reflected in the cost-effectiveness studies? How is our five year experience with nuclear surface forces, including the combat experience in Vietnam, considered in these studies? What is your personal evaluation of this experience?

ANSWER

5. The trade-off between replenishment ships and their escorts required for support of conventionally-powered forces as compared to nuclear-powered forces should be considered. The relative costs of such support forces should provide an added measure of comparison. Additionally, some of the advantages of nuclear power which were enumerated on pages 3 and 4 of my memorandum of 14 April 1966 and within enclosure (1) thereto have not been quantified, but are nonetheless substantial from the standpoint of military effectiveness. Our previous experiences with nuclear surface forces including current combat experience have

not been explicitly considered in previous studies. My personal evaluation of this experience is that good and sufficient operational reasons exist to program more nuclear-powered escorts than are presently programmed.

QUESTION

6. Would you please tabulate and discuss each significant item that bears directly on the relative military effectiveness of nuclear escorts compared to non-nuclear escorts for nuclear aircraft carriers that will be covered in either the Major Fleet Escort Study or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation that is not discussed in Admiral Rickover's memorandum of 3 February 1967. Will the Major Fleet Escort Study or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation be completed in time to influence the type or number of major fleet escorts which will be built in the FY 1968 shipbuilding program now before this committee?

ANSWER

6. I expect the Major Fleet Escort Study and the DX/DXG Study to consider all significant items relating to the military effectiveness of major fleet escorts. I do not believe that information from these projects will be timely for consideration in connection with the FY 1968 shipbuilding program.

QUESTION

7. How has the cutting of the logistics train for propulsion fuel been reflected in the cost-effectiveness studies? Would the lack of this train play an important part in real naval operations? How, and to what extent?

ANSWER

7. NAVWAG 33 examines the effect of oiler losses under certain specified conditions. It was assumed in the computer model for this study that the underway replenishment group is not subject to air attack, that this group is under submarine attack only when the Strike Force (carrier group) is in transit to or from the replenishment area, and that the logistics pipeline is outside the model playing area. Since conventional carrier groups require a larger amount of replenishment support than nuclear carrier groups, increasing the threat to the replenishment group can only increase the differential losses of underway replenishment ships supporting conventional carrier groups compared to nuclear carrier groups. The study results thus indicate that reduced time on the line is caused by oiler losses, and that such reduction is less for CVAN than for CVA. This is obviously not a complete treatment of the problem. I have asked the Major Fleet Escort Study to examine this area in more detail. The lack of any required logistic support would seriously restrain naval operations. Inability to resupply such items as ship propulsion fuel, aircraft fuel, or ordnance could cause curtailment or cessation of operations, in proportion to the extent that such shortages prevailed.

QUESTION

8. As Chief of Naval Operations, if you had to conduct a war against a determined enemy, in which case would you expect to be able to attain our objectives with less loss of American lives:

a. Our nuclear carriers were escorted by one nuclear escort plus some non-nuclear escorts, or

b. Our nuclear carriers were provided with the same number of escorts but all with nuclear propulsion.

ANSWER

8. Generally, I would expect less loss of life with an all-nuclear group because of its reduced vulnerability and lesser dependence on re-supply operations.

QUESTION

9. In the cost effectiveness studies comparing nuclear and non-nuclear surface ships,

what cost and what value is included for American lives? If no values have been included for this in the studies, doesn't this mean that zero cost and zero value have been assigned to American lives in the studies?

ANSWER

9. Cost or value associated with American lives is not included in such studies conducted by the Navy. This does not mean that zero cost and zero value are assigned to American lives in the studies. It is simply a recognition of the fact that in order to keep the cost effectiveness analysis within manageable limits, the cost factors assigned the various elements under study must be both supportable and of finite proportions; that attempting to assign an intrinsic value to a human life would introduce such a questionable and indeed controversial factor into the problem that the objectives of the studies would not be attainable.

QUESTION

10. Does the increase in military effectiveness of a nuclear carrier task group to be achieved by providing nuclear-powered escorts justify the expenditure of the money necessary to provide this capability?

ANSWER

10. In reply to this question, I prefer not to deal with either comparative costs or comparisons of cost-effectiveness between nuclear-powered and conventionally-powered escorts for nuclear carriers. As you are aware, we already have a great deal of information on this subject derived from both theoretical studies and practical experience. In reviewing this subject in the past, I have seen costing figures which vary to such a degree that I fear that (within the realm of reason) one can prove almost anything one wishes to prove provided the assumptions are not prescribed.

There is no doubt in my mind but what nuclear-powered escorts appreciably increase the military effectiveness of a carrier task group whether the carrier is nuclear-powered or not. I also believe that such does cost more, but exactly how much I am not prepared to say. Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam. Since the Navy has a great deal to gain from this development I consider it essential for us to pursue the application of nuclear propulsion to surface vessels. I do not believe it necessary or desirable for us to try to nuclearize the Navy overnight, but we should pursue the use of nuclear propulsion in surface vessels at a moderate rate.

In doing this, I stated before the Congress last year that I thought that a carrier task group composed of one nuclear-powered carrier and four major escorts should have at least two of these major escorts equipped with nuclear power. In reaching this decision it was, of course my opinion that the military capabilities which would be thus enhanced would be sufficient to justify spending the dollars necessary to provide nuclear power in those two escorts. I still believe this and have so testified this year.

QUESTION

11. Isn't the only study to date, other than the studies of Admiral Rickover, which discusses the proper mix of escorts for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier NAVWAG 33? Isn't the only place in that study where the mix is considered in Appendix AA, page 12, where it is said:

"However, limitations on the endurance of the people involved, the ordnance capacity of the CVAN, and the aircraft maintenance cycle, may place a limit on the usable value of such endurance. It has not been possible to place a dollar value on the unique capability of one or two escorts to perform independently for long periods, even though the operational advantages of this capability are recognized. It is, nonetheless, pos-

sible that the incremental value of providing all escorts with this capability may be less than for the first one or two."

"ASW protection requires that some escorts operate in the vicinity of the carrier. These can be refueled as required, with a relatively small loss in screen integrity. Considering the much lower cost of a DDG, compared to a DLGN, the most cost-effective four-ship screen for a nuclear carrier may consist of a mix of nuclear and conventional ships. For an existing conventional carrier, the most cost-effective four-ship screen would be composed of ships having, as nearly as possible, the same endurance as the carrier."

ANSWER

11. In addition to Admiral Rickover's studies and NAVWAG 33, the CNO memorandum of 14 April 1966 and an Office of Program Appraisal (OPA) paper on Analysis of Escort Mixes for CVAN, May 1966, both discuss the mix of escorts for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. NAVWAG 33 does cover this point in Appendix AA, page 12, and also on pages 7, 15, 17, and 23 of that Appendix.

QUESTION

12. Isn't it true, as stated in our report of last year:

"While the study thereafter proceeds to examine various combinations of a conventionally-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts, and a nuclear-powered carrier and various mixes of escorts, at no time thereafter does the study go into the nuclear-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts. Appendix AA is only 25 pages in length."

"Apparently this is the 'elaborate study' as a result of which the Secretary of the Navy 'came to the conclusion that with each nuclear carrier we would like to have two nuclear DLGNs.'"

ANSWER

12. It is true that the study (NAVWAG 33) does not pursue the subject of the nuclear-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts, however, this mix is mentioned in several places.

QUESTION

13. What relative figure of effectiveness do your studies show for the two Tartar D systems in one DLGN compared to the single Tartar D system in one DDG including consideration of the increased missile storage and more complete naval tactical data system in the DLGN?

ANSWER

13. Our studies have developed only tentative figures of effectiveness. I would prefer to not specify these values until we have firmer results.

QUESTION

14. If the Congress should decide to provide nuclear-powered escorts in the Fiscal Year 1968 shipbuilding program should they be of the same design as the nuclear frigate (DLGN 36) provided by Congress in the Fiscal Year 1967 shipbuilding program?

ANSWER

14. Yes.

QUESTION

15. If Congress should decide to provide the additional funds in the Fiscal Year 1968 program necessary to change the two DDGs to two DLGNs, based on your experience and professional military judgment, do you consider the greater military capabilities of the DLGNs would be worth their higher cost?

ANSWER

15. Yes. However, it is still my recommendation that the Navy be authorized 1 DLGN and 2 DDGs for FY 68.

QUESTION

16. On pages 15-16 of the February 3 memorandum by Admiral Rickover to you,

you are reported to have included as one of seven Primary Naval Objectives which appear to demand priority attention:

"Objective: To develop and improve capabilities to conduct sustained naval operations, further, faster, and longer, with decreasing reliance on overseas bases."

"Discussion: Although the United States employs a forward strategy and has made commitments to some forty-three (43) nations, it is clear from viewing current trends that we can expect ever-increasing denial of base and overflight rights overseas. The handwriting is clearly on the wall in NATO, the Middle East, and North Africa, and is beginning to appear in the Western Pacific, [deleted]. The time is soon coming in many areas of potential conflict when we will not be able to move our Army and Air Forces in through friendly ports and airfields as we did in Lebanon, Dominican Republic and Vietnam. Consequently, the Navy is going to be called upon repeatedly for missions in the counter-insurgency and contingency areas as well as those in larger type conflicts. We must be prepared in reasonable depth to respond to these challenges while operating solely from the sea."

One key action necessary to enable this potential objective to be met was set out by you as:

"Introduce nuclear power as rapidly as feasible, concentrating first on those ship types in which the return in effectiveness is greatest, i.e., strike forces, and those which combine naturally into tactical groups wherein uniform steaming characteristics are most important."

Do you still concur with these statements?

ANSWER

16. Yes.

QUESTION

17. How do you evaluate the following statements of Admiral Rickover in his study of February 3, 1967?

(The statements have been quoted above as the main points from the memorandum.)

ANSWER

17. As stated in my endorsement of 20 February to the Secretary of the Navy of Admiral Rickover's study of 3 February which contains these statements, I would support the conclusion that, from an operational viewpoint, all escorts for nuclear carriers should be nuclear powered. My previously stated position, based on an earlier analysis, that each nuclear carrier should have at least two nuclear powered escorts, is not necessarily at variance with concurrence in the efficiency and desirability of all nuclear escorts for nuclear carriers but did, and does, reflect an awareness of the added initial cost of nuclear power and of the finite limits of annual SCN appropriations.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

Last year I made an extensive study of the background out of which the congressional powers with respect to the Navy were included in our Constitution. Further search this year has added nothing more to what I had to say then. However, I believe it so important that I am restating it this year.

Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy" the Department of Defense has refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter. As the Chief of Naval Operations has said with respect to nuclear propulsion:

To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.

After the deliberate failure of the Department of Defense in not following the program for the Navy as set forth in the

statutes, the only answer is to provide that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the construction of the two frigates as soon as practicable.

This is the real civilian control of the military as envisioned by our forefathers. This is the real exercise of the Congress and its constitutional power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Section 101 of S. 2950, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services in 1966, contained, in the section on naval vessels, the sentence:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable.

In my opinion, this provision is constitutional. The Constitution starts out, article I, section I:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article II, section I, on the other hand, provides:

The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

What do these words mean? Legislative? Executive? What did they mean when the Constitution was written? The Dictionary of American English, 1940, University of Chicago Press provides some help:

Legislative: Of or pertaining to a legislature. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

Legislature:

1. The body of assembly of constituted representatives of a colony, state, or territory, vested with authority to make laws for the governance of the body politic. (Citing instances from 1729 on.)

2. The federal Congress. (Citing instances from 1787 on.) Executive department: The, or a, department of government concerned with the proper carrying out of the laws:

1. Of a State government. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)

2. Of the U.S. government. (Citing instances from 1787 on.)

Thus it is that by the very terms of the first sections of both article I and article II of the Constitution, it is the function of the Congress to enact the laws of the United States, and for the President to see that those laws are carried into effect. Lest there be any doubt of this, article II, section 3 provides "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

Under the Articles of Confederation of 1778, there was no executive to carry out the will of Congress—there was only a Congress. This was felt to be a very real drawback. Hence it was that when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 to try to eliminate some of the shortcomings of the Articles of Confederation, the first proposal put before the Convention, that of Edmund Randolph, included the provision:

7. Resolved, that a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for a term of —; to receive punctually, at stated times, a fixed compensation for the services rendered, in which no increase nor diminution shall be made, so as to affect the magistracy existing at the time of increase or diminution; and to be ineligible a second time; and that, besides a gen-

eral authority to execute the national laws, it ought to enjoy the executive rights vested in Congress by the Confederation. ("The Papers of James Madison, and his Reports of Debates in the Federal Convention, 1840," p. 732.)

The next proposal came from Charles Pinckney, including an article VIII which would provide:

The executive power of the United States shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, which shall be his style; and his title shall be His Excellency. He shall be elected for — years; and shall be re-eligible.

He shall from time to time give information to the Legislature, of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration the measures he may think necessary. He shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed. ("Madison Papers," p. 742)

Beyond the introduction and reference to the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style, there was little further that happened to the provisions that the President "shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed" during the Convention.

There were several powers given to the Congress with respect to military affairs:

- To declare War. . .
- To raise and support Armies. . .
- To provide and maintain a Navy. . .
- To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces. . .
- To provide for calling forth the Militia. . .
- To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia. . .

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever. . . and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.

The extent to which the Congress was intended to have the control over the military is best shown by the special provision in the power to raise armies:

But no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two years.

The Founding Fathers were so fearful of having a military imposed on the country that they even wanted to keep the moneys limited so that each Congress would be able to decide how the military would be run.

The reasons for this special provision were given in the debates:

To the second clause Mr. Gerry objected, that it admitted of appropriations to an army for two years, instead of one; for which he could not conceive a reason; that it implied there was to be a standing army, which he inveighed against, as dangerous to liberty—as unnecessary even for so great an extent of country as this—and if necessary, some restriction on the number and duration ought to be provided. Nor was this a proper time for such an innovation. The people would not bear it.

Mr. Sherman remarked, that the appropriations were permitted only, not required to be for two years. As the Legislature is to be biennially elected, it would be inconvenient to require appropriations to be for one year, as there might be no session within the time necessary to renew them. He should himself, he said, like a reasonable restriction on the number and continuance of an army in time of peace.

The second clause was then agreed to, *nem. con.* ("Madison Papers," p. 1495.)

In the Federalist, No. 24, there was discussion of the exact relation between the Executive and the Congress:

A stranger to our politics, who was to read our newspapers at the present juncture, without having previously inspected the plan reported by the convention, would be naturally led to one of two conclusions: either that it contained a positive injunction, that standing armies should be kept up in time of peace; or that it vested in the Executive the whole power of levying troops, without subjecting his discretion, in any shape, to the control of the legislature.

If he came afterwards to peruse the plan itself, he would be surprised to discover, that neither the one nor the other was the case; that the whole power of raising armies was lodged in the Legislature, not in the Executive; that this legislature was to be a popular body, consisting of the representatives of the people periodically elected; and that instead of the provision he had supposed in favor of standing armies, there was to be found, in respect to this object, an important qualification even of the legislative discretion, in that clause which forbids the appropriation of money for the support of an army for any longer period than two years—a precaution which, upon a nearer view of it will appear to be a great and real security against the keeping up of troops without evident necessity."

From this discussion, it is obvious that the Founding Fathers were most fearful of a standing army and that they wanted the controls over that Army to be in the Congress, not in the Executive.

It is claimed that the President has full power over the military from his position, given him by article II, section 2:

The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States.

This position was first suggested by Mr. Charles Pinckney as part of article VIII of his proposed draft. It was incorporated in all later drafts without discussion.

The relation between the powers of the Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy and the position of the President as Commander in Chief were clearly spelled out in the report of this committee on the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESS

While the Constitution designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, it places upon Congress the responsibilities to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Analysis of these constitutional provisions in comparison with the powers of the British Crown, from which the Colonies wrested their independence, clarifies the origin of the responsibilities placed upon Congress by the Constitution. The King—like the President today—had the power of command over the armed forces of Britain, but he also had the power to raise and regulate armies and navies and to govern them.

In contrast, under the Constitution, the President's powers over military affairs were not allowed to pass to him by implication, rising from his position as the Chief Executive. His military authority was specifically designated as command only. The responsibility to provide for the common defense, to

create the forces necessary for such defense, and to make necessary rules for the government of the forces thus created was placed and remains with Congress.

This separation of powers over the military affairs of the Nation was the product of conscious and careful design. It was completely consistent with a fundamental concept upon which our Government was, and is, established; that is, that freedom can thrive only when the basic powers of government are not vested in one man or a small group of men. A firm and distinct separation of power over our military forces was to be expected from men who had experienced the tyranny of a government in which all power over military affairs was vested in one man. Indeed, the abusive employment of military force was a major complaint lodged by the Declaration of Independence against the Crown.

It is apparent that, under the Constitution, the power of Congress over the Military Establishment is, and was intended to be, complete, save for the power to command the forces they create.

Congress has never considered this responsibility to consist merely in providing funds as requested by the executive branch to be used or withheld at its discretion. Under this view, Congress would be unable to discharge its constitutional responsibilities or to insure that the views of the American people, as expressed by their elected representatives, are observed by the executive branch of the Government.

The committee recognizes military power as an instrument of national policy and the necessity for close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches in shaping that policy. If, however, Congress is to perform its constitutional responsibilities and give vitality to the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers, it must retain a meaningful measure of control over the combatant functions of the Armed Forces it creates. Otherwise, the flexibility or rigidity of our military policies will come to rest entirely upon the executive branch of the Government. The legislative branch would thus abdicate its historic responsibility over the design and capabilities of our major instruments of military policy and would renounce its responsibility to provide for the common defense. The Committee on Armed Services is confident, from the testimony of representatives of the executive branch, that this is neither contemplated nor desired by the present incumbents; but it is the responsibility of Congress to insure that the law does not permit such a result.

The committee has made no provision to give the Secretary of Defense increased control over the funds appropriated to his Department. This area of the President's recommendations as set forth in his message of April 3, 1958, was not developed in specific terms by witnesses from the executive branch. It is also an area that will require meticulous examination by Congress.

The executive department has from time to time contended, as early as 1795, that appropriations for military purposes ought to be general or even lump-sum grants to be expended at discretion by the executive rather than specific appropriations. Congress has never accepted this view as being consistent with its responsibility to insure that money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except for a specific object, to an extent, and out of a fund which has been established by law. The relationship of this control over appropriations to the constitutional responsibilities of Congress relating to the Armed Forces, which are enumerated above, is too apparent to necessitate dis-

cussion—House Report No. 1765, 85th Congress, second session, May 22, 1958.

That this analysis is probably correct is shown by the study made by the Library of Congress, "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"—House Document No. 443, 84th Congress, second session, June 14, 1956. Of the 117 instances of the use by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief cited therein, none relates to the composition of the fighting force and its equipment. Rather the instances are directed toward the tactical use of the forces and equipment available in specific instances.

That the President is bound by the legislation, in his capacity as Commander in Chief even in wartime, is shown by the message to Congress of September 2, 1942, in which President Roosevelt demanded repeal of a provision of the Emergency Price Control Act, which he felt to be a hindrance to the war effort, although he threatened to use his powers to achieve the same end if the Congress did not act.

The power of the Congress to provide a navy was first suggested by Charles Pinckney in his proposal:

Article VI. The Legislature of the United States shall have the power . . . To build and equip fleets. ("Madison Papers," p. 739.)

In the debates this phrase was changed to—

To provide and maintain a Navy ("Madison Papers," p. 1360) without discussion and without dissent, as a more convenient definition of the power.

After that, the phrase was accepted by the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style.

While it was not until 1798 that the Congress found it desirable to establish a Department of the Navy—1 Stat. 553, ch. XXXV, April 30, 1798—the Congress in 1794 authorized the President "to provide, by purchase, or otherwise, equip and employ four ships to carry 44 guns each, and two ships to carry 36 guns each."

Not only does the 1794 law provide for the number of guns; it also provides:

That there shall be employed on board each of the said ships of forty-four guns, one captain, four lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one chaplain, one surgeon, and two surgeon's mates; and in each of the ships of thirty-six guns, one captain, three lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one surgeon and one surgeon's mate, who shall be appointed and commissioned in like manner as other officers of the United States are. (1 Stat. 350, Chap. XII, March 27, 1794.)

The statute then goes on to provide for the number of warrant officers for each ship, and the number of men in the crews. The pay of all is set forth—"That the pay and subsistence of the respective commissioned and warrant officers be as follows."

Thus, while the Congress authorized the President to obtain the ships, it specified the armament, the manning, the pay for the officers and even the ration.

There was similar legislation in 1797:

That the President of the United States be and he is hereby empowered, should he deem it expedient, to cause the frigates *United States*, *Constitution* and *Constellation*,

to be manned and employed. (1 Stat. 523, Chap. VII, July 1, 1797)

However, the balance of the law sets forth what the strength in officers and enlisted shall be, what their pay shall be and what shall be the ration.

The provisions of the law of 1799 are even more direct:

That under the orders of the President of the United States, and in addition to the naval armament already authorized by law, there shall be built within the United States six ships of war, of a size to carry, and which shall be armed with not less than seventy-four guns each. (1 Stat. 621, chap. XIII, February 25, 1799)

An examination of the membership of Congress in 1794, 1797, and 1799 shows that, along with the President and Vice President, there were eight Members of Congress in 1794 who attended the Constitutional Convention and five Members of Congress in 1797 and 1799 who attended the Constitutional Convention. Although the laws directed the size of the ships, their manning, pay and rations, there was no recorded discussion on the floor of either the House or the Senate that these requirements were an infringement of the President's prerogatives. On the contrary, the bills always passed on voice votes and were signed immediately by the President.

Again, in 1809, Thomas Jefferson signed into law a bill—

That, in addition to the frigates now employed in actual service, there be fitted out, officered and manned, as soon as may be, the four following frigates, to wit: the *United States*, *Essex*, *John Adams*, and *President* (2 Stat. 514, chap. XI, January 31, 1809).

From the historical background, it is clear not only that the drafters of the Constitution intended the Congress to direct the President in the operation of the Navy, but that the Congress immediately after the adoption of the Constitution did direct the President as to the kinds of ships and armament he should have in the Navy. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson signed one such mandate into law.

There are several instances in recent periods where the Department of Defense has been directed by the Congress with respect to its operations.

In 1952, the Congress directed the Department of Defense to maintain the Marine Corps at a certain level. The precise language of the law—Public Law 416, 82d Congress, chapter 479, 2d session, 61 Stat. 502, June 28, 1952—includes:

The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

On August 10, 1956, the Congress thoroughly reexamined title 10 of the United States Code, Armed Forces, and enacted the title into law. According to House Report No. 970, 84th Congress, 2d session, the real task of preparing the new codification was carried on by the Department of Defense.

Section 101 of title 10 is "Definitions" and contains:

(28) "Shall" is used in an imperative sense.
(29) "May" is used in a permissive sense. The words "no person may" mean that no

person is required, authorized, or permitted to do the act prescribed.

While the first section after the "Definitions" is permissive—

SEC. 121. REGULATIONS.—The President may prescribe regulations to carry out his functions, powers, and duties under this title—

The third section is mandatory:

SEC. 124. COMBATANT COMMANDS.—Establishment; composition; functions; administration and support—

(a) With the advice and assistance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall—

(1) establish unified combatant commands or specified combatant commands to perform military missions; and

(2) shall prescribe the force structure of those commands.

(b) The military departments shall assign forces to combatant commands established under this section to perform the missions of those commands.

Attention should also be drawn to the mandatory language of the fourth section following the definitions:

SEC. 125. Functions, powers, and duties; transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition—

(a) Subject to section 401 of title 50, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action (including the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition of any function, power or duty) to provide more effective, efficient and economical administration and operation, and to eliminate duplication, in the Department of Defense.

Note that the Secretary is directed to provide more effective efficient administration before he is directed to provide more economical administration.

It is exactly the lack of effectiveness and efficiency that has caused the Committee on Armed Services to recommend to the House that it direct the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

From that point on, the title on armed services is replete with mandates in the operation of the Department of Defense and of the military departments.

There are also other mandates in the United States Code directed to the Department of Defense. For example, the matter of pay is directed by the Congress. Thus in section 2211 of title 5, the pay of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and some of their subordinates are set forth. Title 37 of the United States Code is devoted to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services. Congress sets the pay levels mandatorily. That is why it is necessary to have title III to S. 2950 as reported by the committee, when the committee believes that pay actions in other parts of the Federal Government make it equitable to increase the pay of the members of our armed services.

The mandatory language we have been discussing was taken from another statute, passed by the Congress and approved by the President. In 1957, the Congress, on the proposal of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, directed the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake various studies and research leading to the construction of some new kind of reactors. Included in the reactors which the Congress wanted to have built, and which the Atomic Energy Commission

was opposed to building, was a plutonium recycle experimental reactor. In order to be sure that this reactor was constructed the Congress wrote into the authorization act for fiscal year 1958 the following language of section 110(a):

The Commission shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the prototype power reactor facility authorized by section 101 for project 58-e-15 (plutonium recycle experimental reactor) at an installation operated by or on behalf of the Commission and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installation. (Public Law 85-162, 71 Stat. 403, August 21, 1957.)

Similar mandatory language was included in sections 110 and 111 of the authorization act for fiscal year 1959—Public Law 85-590, 72 Stat. 490, August 4, 1958.

The mandatory language in our bill is necessary. Following the construction of the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach*, authorized in fiscal year 1957, and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*, authorized in fiscal year 1959, there have been no proposals from the Department of Defense to have any more nuclear escorts. In fiscal year 1962, the Congress changed one frigate, the *Truxtun*, to nuclear power and in 1963 it authorized another nuclear frigate which was later canceled by the Department of Defense.

In 1955, the Congress authorized \$150.5 million for another nuclear frigate and appropriated \$20 million toward it. Despite the appeals of the Department of the Navy, these funds have never been released by the Department of Defense.

In 1956, the Secretary of Defense testified before our committee:

There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for.

Despite this testimony, the Secretary of Defense had not released the \$20 million appropriated in 1955.

Under the words and history of the Constitution, under the first statutes putting into practice the ideas of our Constitution, and under recent legislative practices drafted in part by and accepted by the executive branch, there is no doubt that the Congress has the power to prescribe the kind of ships that will be built for the Navy. In view of the history of Department of Defense defiance to the will of Congress, the power can well be exercised. The language—"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable"—is constitutional. The Congress has the power to direct the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

It seems to me the time has long since passed when we should have nuclear power for our surface ships. Let us not take two-thirds of a century again, as we did 100 years ago, in making a necessary

transition. Let us cut the chains that bind our fighting ships to a pipeline.

Let us cut the umbilical cord from the mother ship so that these nuclear ships can do the kind of a job that our country and the times demand.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Congress has a great responsibility to the defense of this Nation and to the protection of the peoples throughout the world. The Secretary of Defense has assumed unto himself the complete authority as to what should be done or should not be done even though the Congress has enacted legislation and the President has signed such legislation into law. It is my further opinion that we have a grave responsibility under the Constitution—it is not only a responsibility but a duty—to provide and maintain a Navy to meet any and all emergencies and an Army and any other necessary components with which to deal with our national defense.

The only thing I can add, is that in "Trial by Impeachment," by Theodore W. Dwight, is the description of the impeachment of Michael De La Pole, Earl of Suffolk and Chancellor of England:

The Earl of Suffolk was dismissed from his Chancellorship, and immediately afterwards was impeached by the Commons for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

The third charge in the trial was:

3. That when Parliament granted a tax to be expended in a specific manner in guarding the sea "as it was ordered to have been" yet it was not so expended "whereas many mischiefs have already happened, and more are likely to enure for the realm, and all this by the default of the said Lord Chancellor.

If we do not shortly begin to get our advanced manned strategic aircraft, our antiballistic missile system and our nuclear Navy then the question before Congress will be:

Can the appointed Secretary of Defense thwart the exercise of the constitutional powers of the Congress to raise and support Armies and to provide and maintain a Navy?

The Parliament had spoken. The law was clear, but the Chancellor failed to act, and to assume his responsibility under the mandate of that law.

So here in the U.S., Congress today speaks as it has spoken before. Whether or not the Secretary of Defense will act as we have asked him to act before, and as we command him to act in this bill, remains to be seen. But in any event let us here assume our responsibility as we see it. The committee bill and the report before us recognizes our obligations under the Constitution and the oath of office we took which bound us to exercise these duties as Representatives of the American people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and commend him for his statement.

I should like to say just this: that I have supported all these defense bills, and I intend to support this one, but my faith in the operations of the Department of Defense under the present Secretary of Defense is being shaken more

almost every day, and these bills are becoming more and more difficult to accept. I would take the time to give only one or two reasons from my personal observations, one being Secretary McNamara's award of the contract for the TFX, now known as the F-111A and F-111B supersonic military planes. Without going into the financial ramifications of this contract, the military still does not have an acceptable plane. Certainly we do not have a dual-purpose plane, and apparently never will have a dual-purpose aircraft as the contract provided for originally, and on which hundreds of millions of dollars have already been expended.

In the second place Congress, in 1962, enacted a law, commonly known as the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, in an effort to do something about the scandals in the award of contracts in the Defense Department. The Comptroller General of the United States, as the members of the Committee on Armed Services well know, made a sampling of 186 prime and sub-contracts issued by the Secretary of Defense and found that only 20 of these contracts conformed to the Truth-in-Negotiations Act.

How much of the money in this bill, I ask, will go out on negotiated contracts with the law being ignored by the Secretary of Defense?

The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Staats, castigated the Department of Defense for failing to observe the plain provisions of the law enacted in 1962 for the specific purpose of safeguarding the expenditure of public funds.

So I say to my friend from Massachusetts that in my opinion it is high time we got a better quality of performance from the Department of Defense. I say again, that some of us are being taxed to the utmost to support these bills only to find the laws have not been observed; that the proper administration is lacking.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments, and particularly for his reference to the TFX. I will say to the gentleman that several years ago when this plane was first proposed as a plane common both to the Air Force and to the Navy, that I had grave doubts about it. But the Secretary of Defense believed through the common use of this one plane flying for both purposes he could save a lot of money and would still have the effectiveness the services require. Obviously, as time has gone by, it is quite clear that what the Navy had expected in its version of this plane has not come to pass. They are still having considerable trouble with this plane.

As we all well recall, only a few days ago this plane did crash up in Long Island, and the pilot was killed.

I think the big difficulty is we are trying to have a compromise and talking of trades and I do not believe that in the dangerous world in which we live and in which we commit our men to battle that we can have a compromise airplane serving all purposes that can compete with

an uncompromised airplane that an enemy might design.

I think we can do better than what we have done through the compromise in this particular case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Going beyond the shocking financial aspects of the TFX contract, and the way in which the award was made, I want to come back to the pending bill which provides for longer periods of service for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is that not correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct. Not to the present ones, but this pertains to those under the next President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I understand—it would be in the future. This I take it was because of the sordid manipulation that went on when Gen. Curtis LeMay opposed the McNamara award of the TFX contract, as did Admiral Anderson, the admiral was virtually shanghaied out of the service and General LeMay was put on probation—in other words, a 1-year reappointment—which is virtually unheard of, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So I am pleased that this bill provides a longer tenure, more hoped for protection for those in the military who have the courage to speak out frankly and honestly.

General LeMay and Admiral Anderson were punished for their opposition to Secretary McNamara in his high-handed award of the TFX contract, and that punishment served as a lesson to other military commanders of the fate that could await them if they dealt honestly and frankly with Congress.

Mr. BATES. I want to thank the gentleman.

Our committee was unanimously in favor of the extended period of time for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The purpose is obvious. We want to have people come before us who will tell us exactly what is on their mind. I must say that it is getting more and more difficult to get the facts that we are looking for. The facts are not volunteered and we want ultimately to get answers and it would seem to me we should get such answers other than the prejudged determination of someone else when the witnesses come before us. It is our responsibility as indicated in the Constitution so far as I am concerned and I know so far as the Members of this Committee are concerned, we are determined to exercise our responsibilities under the Constitution and as we understand that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 19 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with what the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has said about the Joint Chiefs and our responsibility, I want to read the directive whereby members of the Department of Defense are permitted to testify before our committee.

The letter is as follows:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

Memorandum for the Secretaries of the Departments; the Director of Defense Research and Engineering; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Assistant Secretaries of Defense; the General Counsel; the Assistants to the Secretary of Defense; the Directors, Defense Agencies.

Subject: Congressional appearances by Department of Defense witnesses.

I have been asked by prospective witnesses to provide guidance for the benefit of personnel of the Department who, in the course of congressional hearings, are required to give their personal opinions on matters concerning which a Department of Defense position has been established by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. If pressed for his personal opinion, the witness should make clear:

1. that his personal views were expressed (if such be the fact) to appropriate authorities within the Defense Department before the departmental position was established;
2. where his views are not in accord with the departmental decision, that, notwithstanding his personal views, he has accepted and will abide by the departmental position; and
3. the considerations or factors which support the decision; in other words, the pros and cons on the issue involved.

CYRUS VANCE.

As you see, Mr. Chairman, that is the directive. We never, never, never get any voluntary statement. A voluntary statement would be a strange thing indeed. When these people testify, we have to cross-examine them sometimes like an attorney cross-examines a defendant to get information.

We think that the 4-year provision for the future will improve the quality of the testimony in the long run.

I would like to put it this way. It will make for more of an unconscious independence, if you catch the point. That is what we are trying to do.

I do not know how to run an army in the field. What do I know about running a vessel on the high seas? What do I know about the strategic problems of a long-range bombing mission? What do I know about the tactical problems of a battlefield saturation mission?

Let the military do this. That is what they learn at the Academies. Why should they not tell us their problems—the shortage of pilots, the reasons for it, the breakdown of certain types of aircraft? Why should they not develop that information? Must we ask the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] to issue a directive to the Department of Defense agencies all over the world to find out what is breaking down in the Army, Navy, and Air Force? Cannot the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] come up with what is necessary in research and development?

We want people who are dedicated and motivated to give to their Congress what is needed to secure America. That is the reason behind it.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has a 4-year term. Since this has been enacted, his testimony has been more independent than that of his colleagues. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my fine friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Only about 3 weeks ago the Secretary of Defense appeared before a committee of which I am a member. I had the opportunity of asking him about the shortage of pilots, and he denied that there was a shortage. I am sure that had those in uniform who accompanied him felt free to testify, they would have provided a different story with respect to the shortage of military pilots that was then apparent and is now admitted. The shortage did not develop in a matter of weeks.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation and particularly I speak in behalf of the fast deployment logistic ship program as a necessary tool for our national defense. It will allow us to meet our commitments promptly and to save lives and to assure victory in cases where it might not otherwise be assured. It can help to prevent wars and to diminish the escalation of wars. We should get on with the program at the earliest possible moment.

Long ago, President Washington stated:

The path to peace is through the preparation for war.

As times change, the needs of our country in being prepared also change.

For many years, our country has relied upon American-flag merchant marine vessels and the vessels of friendly countries to provide the necessary transportation of war materiel and personnel to places where wars must be fought or where strength must be shown to prevent war. We have found in the Vietnam war that these sources of shipping are not adequate for modern times. Our own maritime industry has shown a reluctance to make the ships available because of the world shipping losses which would occur to them and to our Nation. Our allies have not furnished the ships which we need.

Although our immediate needs have been met, the handwriting of warning is on the wall; and something must be done to prepare for a future that will give us overseas, prompt availability of the needed tools of war.

Two things have already been done. In the first place, we have already shipped and stored across the seas, in various localities, large quantities of military materiel to be available in general localities for ultimate shipping to specific spots where the need may arise.

Second, we have, in the last few years, greatly increased our combat airlift capacity. It is not, however, economically feasible to move by air the tremendous quantities of materiel needed in any large operation; for the cost of this procedure would be prohibitive; much greater than what the proposed new type of ship program would cost.

Therefore, there remains a need for speedy placement of the needed weapons in quantity, without the long leadtimes of advanced notice which would be required if merchant ships were to be used.

The Department of Defense has come up with the idea of the fast deployment logistic ship, a vessel specifically designed to carry all that would be needed in the way of weapons and to have these loaded ships placed around the world in a quickly movable manner. Of course, even with such vessels there would still be, in any great war, a need for calling upon the merchant marine for a reserve capacity.

It is planned to have perhaps 30 such fast deployment logistic ships. The cost of the construction of each is estimated to be about \$30 million apiece for construction. The cost of maintaining each of them through their lifespan, including the cost of the crews, maintenance men, and communications personnel, would run another \$30 or \$40 million. Thus, the cost of the program is about \$70 million a ship times 30 ships or \$2.1 billion.

A giant step forward occurred when the President in his annual budget message to Congress asked for five of these ships, to begin the program. Two experimental ships were authorized and funded in fiscal year 1966, but the Department of Defense postponed the construction of these ships for consideration of the package concept in producing the FDLS, which was proposed by the President this year. The purpose of this postponement is to reduce the ultimate expense of each of the FDLS ships and the whole package. This way we will take full advantage of the multiple procurement program for the ships. The House Armed Services Committee has approved four of the FDLS's; the two recommended by Congress in 1966 and two more this year. This recommendation includes cancellation costs if the whole program concept is not later approved.

The personnel aboard each ship would consist of Army personnel who would maintain the equipment; Navy personnel who would man the communications activities; and finally, civilian maritime personnel who would operate the ship itself.

Capt. Lloyd Sheldon, president of the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, said in an interview in the New York Times that the program should not be approved and that—

Both the unions and private business will be knocked out of the military end of the shipping business if this program is approved.

Some others in organized labor have taken a similar view.

But when all of the facts and data are considered, organized labor may find that this program will be in no way detrimental to them, but actually of assistance. The reason for this is that, as I have already indicated, there will be certain permanently employed civilian maritime personnel in this program which would be added to the job opportunities for those now employed in maritime activities. The number of such new jobs would be somewhere between 1,000 and 2,000. When this becomes clear, I would think that the maritime unions would support the program.

There is some opposition from parts of the maritime industry and that opportu-

nity can probably be best summarized by the statement of Congressman LEGGETT in his letter to the President dated January 9, 1967, in which he said:

Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function, i.e., a true modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense.

The weakness of this position is that no merchant fleet which is engaged in active maritime voyages can be readily available in the time frame that is needed and contemplated for these FDL ships, even if all of the difficulties of obtaining the ships for the military can be overcome in time of war.

Currently, the United States ranks only sixth among the world's active fleets—behind the United Kingdom, Liberia, Japan, Russia, and Norway.

At the present time, owners of the merchant fleet argue that they do not wish to furnish ships which have been financed with Federal assistance because to do so interferes with theirs, and the U.S. world trade.

So, what Congressman LEGGETT argues for is not likely to be a real solution to the problem confronting our country. Moreover, the presence of these FDL ships will, to an extent, allow the maritime industry to have a more solid and permanent base for their investments and operations on a continuous basis, regardless of whether war occurs or not.

The 30 FDL ships would be but about 2 percent of the number of ships in the total U.S. merchant marine.

The decline of merchant marine shipbuilding in the United States has been well publicized. Russia is outbuilding us by a ratio of 12 to 1 on numbers of ships and 8 to 1 by tonnage.

In addition, Soviet shipyards are operating at near capacity; about half of the capacity of this country is today idle. Some shipbuilders feel that the increasing Russian fleet will be her principal economic weapon against the West; the Soviets having the power to control ocean freight rates.

What they overlook is that these ships in key positions throughout the world can position materiel where needed at a cheaper cost in time and money than having to airlift thousands of tons of equipment by air in time of crisis. The merchant fleet could not be depended on to have the capability, to be loaded and assembled in the positions needed to deliver, a division-worth of Army equipment with complete unit integrity in less than a few months.

America suffers a serious disadvantage in shipbuilding: We now rank 14th among the 15 chief shipbuilding nations in the world.

Some shipbuilders now have positive thoughts on this project because they feel the new assembly line type production of ships, similar to the well-known Arendal yard in Sweden, which has developed a standardization in design will help mold modern yards. Some individual shipyards may be hurt by the new concept; but, overall good will be felt by the industry.

There have been questions of the need for a new shipyard to build these ships. The program could be undertaken in

several shipyards now in existence, but the cost would be much, much higher and at a reduced level of standardization. There is no single shipyard presently capable of delivering all of these ships at the requisite rate.

Greater economies in shipbuilding from this program will result in overall benefits to the merchant marine as well as to the Navy. The FDLS program will represent only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding effort on an annual basis for the next 6 years. It is difficult to see how this could create a monopoly.

What of the small shipbuilder? There will continue to be many ship programs involving relatively small numbers of ships and others involving larger numbers of small ships.

In view of the realities of the present situation in shipbuilding in the United States, there are now a goodly number of shipbuilding companies who are giving approval to the FDLS program. This is not to say that all are in agreement but the trend is in the direction of approval.

I did not approach this program and its implications with any prejudice; and I sought out the facts in a quest only for what is best for our country. After this study it appears clear to me that the program is needed and that the benefits from it will be experienced not only in the added defense strength of our country, but in the upgrading of our shipbuilding and maritime industries, which greatly need any assistance they can get.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN] as much time as he may require.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 9240, the military defense procurement, research, and development authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 in the amount of \$21.4 billion.

The reason I am pleased is because I believe this legislation to be forward-looking and very responsive to the defense needs of our country for today—and tomorrow. Additionally, it is my feeling that Chairman RIVERS is to be complimented for his leadership in formulating and shaping this bill to meet present and future requirements, as he sees them, and as our colleagues on the Armed Services Committees see them.

Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy task, and it usually is a thankless one, for the chairmen of the respective Armed Services Committees to lead their committee members, their hearings, and their reports through the enormous amount of material that comes from the Defense Department regarding the largest portion of the Federal budget each year. Decisions of monumental consequence must be made. They cannot be procrastinated, nor can they be held in abeyance.

For example, we discussed and made far-ranging decisions on the present and future of the anti-ballistic-missile system—a decision which is directly related to our foreign affairs and foreign policy in the cold war; we considered and made decisions on the future of the fast deployment logistics ships, decisions which directly affect the future of our shipbuilding industry, and we made numer-

ous other decisions of vital national and international significance.

Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the decisions that the House Armed Services Committee has made on these issues. I feel that the committee has performed a public service in presenting the committee's position on these issues in a clear and concise fashion in the report on H.R. 9240.

Looking at our functions in general terms, I feel that the problems of making these decisions are compounded by two requirements: First, is to make certain that we meet our obligations in Southeast Asia and the day-to-day needs of our forces there. Second, is the necessity to maintain our military posture in the world by moving ahead at a reasonable speed in the development of the new weapons systems but without leaping ahead too far and too fast in a manner which wastes taxpayers' money and fails to keep up with technological developments as they occur. In this respect, I do believe that our first line of defense is deterrents through a strong military offensive capability. I believe that this bill, H.R. 9240, fully meets these requirements.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who is the chairman of our very important Subcommittee on Research and Development, as much time as he may require.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H.R. 9240, includes \$7.3 billion for Defense research, development, test, and evaluation. The amount recommended, in terms of new obligational authority, is \$212 million more than was appropriated last year and is \$127 million more than the Congress authorized last year, including the supplemental authorization and appropriation bills considered earlier this year. The amount requested for research and development reflects a reduction of approximately \$900 million by the Office of the Secretary of Defense from the amounts submitted in the budget requests of the military departments.

The Committee on Armed Services made only one change in the research and development programs submitted to the Congress. We added \$25 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA. This action by the committee was strongly recommended by the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Air Force, and all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has long been the position of the Committee on Armed Services that the Nation should have a balanced strategic force consisting of both manned and unmanned systems, missiles, and aircraft. From the standpoint of unmanned systems, the Nation is in a very strong position with our Minuteman and Titan missiles deployed and operational in the continental limits of the United States and our fleet ballistic missile system deployed, or ready for deployment, in the oceans of the world.

From the standpoint of manned systems, our posture will deteriorate in the 1970's unless we develop and produce a replacement for the aging fleet of B-52 bombers. Last year the Congress was told

of the decision to convert the TFX, now known as the F-111, into a long-range strategic bomber, the FB-111. However, this weapon system will, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as many of our military leaders, be an interim system only; therefore, the need for an advanced manned strategic aircraft to replace the B-52's and fill the gap not covered by the FB-111.

The funds recommended by the committee for this program will enable the Air Force to initiate the contract definition phase of development during the early months of fiscal year 1968. Initiation of contract definition is not a commitment on the part of the Air Force to produce the aircraft in question. The purpose of contract definition is to determine the design and operational characteristics of the aircraft and to establish cost parameters for the development and production of the total weapon system. If the contract definition phase is successfully completed during the coming year, the budget request for fiscal year 1969 will undoubtedly include a substantial increase in research and development funds necessary for a major development effort on the AMSA.

In view of the limited time I have been allotted, I cannot describe the total research and development program of the Department of Defense. Therefore, I will touch only upon those major projects requiring the greatest dollar amounts.

For the Army, the largest program is the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile system which totals \$443 million. Much has been said and written about this program over the past few years. You will recall that our research and development efforts on a ballistic missile defense system were first begun by the Department of Defense in 1955 with the project known as the Nike-Zeus. Since the beginning of that research effort, over \$4 billion have been expended by the Department of Defense. While the Army has consistently recommended deployment of an antiballistic missile system, it has been only the last 2 years that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously recommended the deployment of Nike X.

The Secretary of Defense has stated that he will take no action now to deploy Nike X pending the outcome of the current negotiations with the Soviet Union designed to limit the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. The Secretary stated to the committee that in the event these negotiations prove unsuccessful, it is proposed to reconsider the deployment decision. Funds have been included in the fiscal year 1968 budget to provide for such actions as may be required at that time. The funds contained in the budget before you are said to be adequate to initiate production if the decision is made to do so, so there is no argument as to the proper funding level for the coming fiscal year.

The question is when to deploy and what degree of deployment is desired. Many different levels of deployment have been studied and proposed ranging from a defense of our cities against attack by the Soviet Union at a cost of \$20 billion or more to a level of deployment

called austere, which would offer a high degree of protection for the whole Nation against a missile attack in the 1970's from the Red Chinese—at a cost to the United States of about \$3½ billion. It is said that this austere deployment could be coupled with the defense of our missile forces into a "thin defense" for a total cost of about \$4 billion. Since it will take months and years to produce and deploy the Nike X system, regardless of the level of deployment, it seems to me that we should begin the production now and make judgments at the proper times in the future as the necessary final level of deployment. The major effort should probably be toward the thin deployment and then—as the difficult production problems are overcome and the reaction of our potential enemies is studied—the necessary changes, if needed, can be introduced into the deployment plans.

In my opinion, we, as a nation, in the 1970's will need the protection that only the Nike X antiballistic missile system can provide. No one can guarantee when Red China will have an operational ICBM capability that will be a threat to the security of our country. Their development efforts can be accelerated without our knowledge, thereby giving them an earlier operational capability than presently predicted. On the other hand, I realize that development problems can be encountered which would delay that same date. Likewise, we could encounter similar delays in the production and deployment of the Nike X system. Rather than gamble on this unnecessary risk, I, as a Member of Congress, am willing to spend the funds now to provide some degree of protection against ballistic missiles at a safe date in the early 1970's.

Another missile system supported by the bill before you is the Sam D. While this missile system is intended to provide a more effective air and missile defense of the field Army, it will also provide a capability within the United States for defense against submarine-launched missiles. This advanced air defense system will replace the Hercules and Hawk batteries in the 1970's.

Two other Army development efforts that I will describe briefly are in the aircraft and related equipment area. In July 1965, General Westmoreland stated that an urgent requirement existed for an improved armed helicopter to escort troop-carrying helicopters without having to degrade the speed capability of the troop carrier. To fill this critical need in the shortest possible time, the Army initiated a program on the UH-1 series of aircraft as an interim measure pending the development of a more advanced aerial fire support system now known as the AH-56A. This interim armed helicopter, designated the Hueycobra, is being flight-tested at the present time and will be deployed to Vietnam in the very near future. The Hueycobra will replace the UH-1B/C as a primary armed helicopter in Vietnam. On an escort mission the Hueycobra will have an approximately 30-percent cruise speed advantage over the UH-1D troop carrier helicopter. It will be able to protect the

flanks of the air mobile column as well as dash ahead to conduct reconnaissance and provide suppressive fire in the landing zone.

Although the Hueycobra is being sent to Vietnam as an improved armed helicopter, the Army considers it to be an interim measure since the aircraft reportedly will not meet all the requirements of a fully integrated three-dimensional gunship. For this requirement the Army is continuing development of an advanced aerial fire support system which I indicated was the AH-56A, and will be named the Cheyenne. The first prototype was rolled out on May 3 and will immediately begin a series of systems tests leading to the first flight test later this year. This helicopter is designed to fly at nearly twice the speed of combat helicopters now in Vietnam. The Army is very excited about the potential operational capability of this armed helicopter/aircraft.

The largest single research and development program in the Navy budget is the fleet ballistic missile system, which includes the Polaris and Poseidon missiles. This program totals almost 25 percent of the Navy research, development, test, and evaluation budget for fiscal year 1968, and represents an increase of over \$80 million from last year. The Polaris system was initially deployed in November 1960. The fleet ballistic missile force has grown considerably in size and capability since that date. Forty ballistic missile submarines have been commissioned. The 41st, and last, SSBN in the approved program, the *Will Rogers*, will be ready for deployment in the late summer of this year.

Improvement in the fleet ballistic missile system has been as significant as the growth and size of the force. The 1,200-mile Polaris A-1 missile has been retired. All submarines on deployment now carry 1,500-mile Polaris A-2 or 2,500-mile A-3's. In December 1965, the Secretary of Defense directed that development of the Poseidon missile be pursued. This year the Congress is being asked to approve production for deployment. Poseidon will have even greater range and accuracy than Polaris. In order to take advantage of its greater operational capability, the Navy now plans to equip 31 of the nuclear missile submarines with the Poseidon. The remaining 10 boats of the authorized force will carry the A-3 missile.

Included in the Navy request are development funds for six models of fleet aircraft; the F-111B interceptor; the A-7A light attack aircraft; the EA-6B attack warfare aircraft; a new carrier-based antisubmarine aircraft, now referred to as VSK; an advanced carrier-based early warning and control aircraft E-2B; and preliminary work required for a new multimission fighter attack aircraft, FAX.

An air-to-surface tactical missile under development by the Navy which has the strong support of the committee is the Condor missile. Last year the committee increased the funds requested for the development of this system. However, Congress elected not to appropriate all the funds authorized. This missile will be the first weapon to allow attack aircraft to deliver a conventional warhead

with high accuracy without exposing the launch aircraft to ground fire and missiles in the target area. I am sure that our pilots flying over North Vietnam would like to have this missile in their inventory today.

The manned orbiting laboratory—MOL—is the largest single program in the Air Force research and development budget request. This program consists of a Titan III space booster, a Gemini spacecraft, a laboratory vehicle, and supporting equipment. The booster planned to be used is designated the Titan III-M which differs from the Titan III-C by having an uprated core and seven-segment solid propellant motor in place of a five-segment motor. The spacecraft will be the Gemini B which was developed in the national space program, but modified for the MOL application. The laboratory vehicle is being designed specifically for the MOL program. The Air Force objectives in the program are threefold. First, to determine, in greater detail, the capabilities of man in space, particularly with defense application. Secondly, to develop equipment that will contribute to subsequent manned and unmanned space flight. And, lastly, to experiment with these equipments. The fiscal year 1968 budget for the MOL is \$430 million which will be used to complete design work and continue fabrication of flight hardware.

The largest aircraft development program is the C-5A for which \$305 million is included in the bill before us. This is the third year of full-scale development. The C-5A, with a maximum gross weight of well over 700,000 pounds, will be the world's largest airplane and represents a tremendous stride in the evolution of aircraft. It will be able to move 110 tons of cargo more than 3,000 nautical miles in 7 to 8 hours. Each of the four TF-39 fan jet engines will deliver 41,000 pounds of thrust, double that of today's commercial fan jet engines, while at the same time reducing specific fuel consumption by one-fourth. Delivery of the first production C-5A is scheduled for mid-1969.

As a member of the Military Airlift Subcommittee, I cannot help but have a feeling of pride in the development of this aircraft, as well as the C-141 which is now in our inventory and performing such a splendid job in support of our forces in Southeast Asia. Much of the credit for the great increase in our strategic aircraft capability over the past 6 years belongs to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, our illustrious leader, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. As chairman of the Airlift Subcommittee in 1960 and again in 1963, he forcefully revealed the deficits then existing in our total airlift capability to meet wartime requirements. He fought for the modernization of the Military Air Transport Service by requesting the Congress to appropriate the funds for the C-135 and the C-130E. His subcommittee also strongly recommended the development of the C-141 and the C-5A. As a result of these actions, our strategic airlift capability by 1970 will have increased 1,000 percent in this decade.

While not in the research and development section, the bill before you includes \$60 million for procurement of additional

C-130E's. These are badly needed by the Tactical Air Command to replace those lost in Southeast Asia during fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Based on the hearings held by the Airlift Subcommittee in 1965 and 1966, I strongly believe that still additional aircraft are needed to provide tactical airlift capability to meet the requirements imposed upon the Tactical Air Command. It is my desire as chairman of the newly reestablished Military Airlift Subcommittee to again carefully review this area of airlift later in this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have covered only a very few of the projects and programs supported by the \$7.3 billion contained in this bill. While this is the largest dollar amount ever authorized for research and development by the Department of Defense, it does not necessarily reflect an increase in effort over previous years. The 3-percent dollar increase is said to be less than the normal annual cost-of-living increases which affect research and development efforts as well as production. In my opinion, the funds requested are austere. The amount included in this budget for research and development is almost \$900 million less than that requested by the military services and is intended in the words of Defense witnesses to provide "only the funds necessary to support research and development efforts where the problems are pressing, the needs clear, the approach sound, and the talent available."

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the approval of the bill as reported from the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, in support of that portion of H.R. 9240 dealing with research and development, I would like to direct my remarks to the subject of the Army research program on night vision devices.

In discussions of Vietnam one often hears the expression "The night belongs to the Vietcong." For several years now the Army has been actively pursuing a program entitled "Night Vision," which will change that ownership. The impact of this program on future warfare is enormous. No longer will the fall of darkness mark the stop or even slowdown of the tempo of operations. No longer will darkness offer our enemies either opportunity for counterattack or even rest from our own relentless pressure. The accomplishments and promise of the night vision program are such that this dramatic change will be a reality.

This is not a new program, it is one that the Army has been pursuing for a number of years. The Army's early recognition of the promise and wholehearted support of the program has pioneered the way in developing items of night vision equipment.

The Army has also prepared a program, taking advantage of these new developments to provide our forces in Vietnam with interrelated sets of night vision and radar equipment to further improve our night combat capabilities. The basic objective is to so equip our infantry and air mobile forces along with their supporting artillery and surveil-

lance units so that they can extend their daylight successes into the night. The program is entitled "Sea Niteops." As this program is completed, the Vietcong, who resupply, move, and fight predominantly at night will find themselves as exposed and vulnerable to our superior forces as though it were daylight.

Because the Army is leading the way in this new and expanding technology, its program has been growing rapidly over the past few years. The current budget provides for both the continued expansion of the night vision R. & D. program and the Vietnam-oriented Sea Niteops. The Army is to be commended for its aggressive leadership in this area.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee and Mr. BATES have given an excellent overall picture of this important bill. I would like to make some further remarks about specific elements of the program.

On the occasion of his appearance before the committee when he presented the proposed Navy 1968 aircraft procurement program, Vice Adm. Thomas Connolly addressed what I construed as the Navy's minimum need for the phase-in of more effective aircraft and for the replacement of projected combat and operational losses.

The overall figure he used at that time for all categories of naval aircraft was 695; these are included in the 1968 authorization we have before us.

It might be well to consider our national dependence on the sea-based striking force concept—the enormous dividends we have derived as a result of our wise but sometimes hesitant investment in the heart of the concept—the attack aircraft carrier with its embarked carrier air wing. Its record during the past 3 years in the Vietnamese war underscores both its military and political independence and causes me to recall a statement made by Winston Churchill toward the close of World War II. The great Englishman observed:

If we didn't have aircraft carriers, we would have had to invent them.

The quote has significant application here and now.

Navy and Marine airmen introduced the first tactical night and all-weather attack capability into Southeast Asia. Tribute must be paid to the Navy/industry teams which conceived and brought to operational fruition the Grumman A-6A Intruder, E-2A Hawkeye, the McDonnell F-4 Phantom II and the North American RA-5C Vigilante. Superlatives are justified in the case of each.

The Intruder is the world's finest all-weather attack airplane.

The Hawkeye has advanced the state of the art of airborne air control on a quantum basis to the benefit of all of our services flying operational aircraft in Southeast Asia. While it does not appear in this authorization, it is worthy of such mention.

The Phantom is the standard of the fighter or interceptor world—the fastest and most effective aircraft of its type flying today as well as a uniquely effective attack bomber.

Our reconnaissance posture, with the advent of the Vigilante integrated operational intelligence system, leaves little to be desired.

The nature of the other airplanes appearing in the authorization bespeaks increased effectiveness for the Navy-Marine team. Ling-Temco-Vought's A-7A Corsair II is on the verge of operational deployment and will add longer legs, increased loiter time and larger ordnance load-carrying ability to the sea-based commander's power portfolio.

Marine aviation looks eagerly and rightfully to the North American OV-10A Bronco since its introduction will enhance an already proven and vital ability to support troop maneuver and consolidation.

In the same light, one of the most astonishing impacts of the so-called primitive war in Vietnam is to be noted in the helicopter buys proposed in the authorization. Combat use of massed helicopters was something few experts predicted, yet we have been shown dramatically that the versatility and mobility inherent in these machines have been the key tools in coping with Vietcong guerrilla tactics.

And now I would like to turn for a moment to an item in the Army procurement portion of the bill—an item which does not receive as much attention as I think it should.

As you are aware, the authorizing authority of the Congress with respect to weapons systems has grown since the first enactment of the so-called 412 law in 1959. The latest addition to that law requires specific authorization for tracked combat vehicles—and it is to these vehicles that I would like to direct my remarks at this time.

The authorization recommended by the committee for the support of the tracked combat vehicles for the Army is \$424.7 million, representing about 7 percent of the Army's fiscal year 1968 PEMA budget.

Among the vehicles to be procured under the authorization are additional quantities of several with new combat capabilities. These include the armored reconnaissance/airborne assault vehicle, XM-551—General Sheridan—and the M-60A1E2 tank, both mounting as the principal armament the Shillelagh weapons system. With this combination gun and guided missile system, the XM-551 and the M-60A1E2 are equipped to disrupt troop concentrations, reduce strong points, and defeat any known enemy armor.

Improved capabilities are represented by the full-tracked cargo carrier, M-548. This vehicle, adapted from the M-113 armored personnel carrier, is designed to serve primarily as an ammunition supply vehicle for self-propelled artillery units, affording a degree of mobility equal to that of the new lightweight, self-propelled guns and howitzers that it will support. The M-548 will also serve as the carrier vehicle for the Army's Chaparral air defense system.

Included in the request are funds for additional quantities of the self-propelled air defense gun, XM-163—Vulcan. This weapon, with its multibarrel automatic 20-millimeter cannons, will

provide antiaircraft fire against low-flying aircraft and can be used to deliver ground fire against personnel and lightly armored vehicles.

Funds are also programed for additional buys of other tracked combat vehicles to enable the Army to meet authorized acquisition objectives, equip new units, replace combat and other losses, and, to a limited extent, modernize its inventory.

Additional procurements are planned of the full-tracked, self-propelled 155-millimeter medium howitzer, M-109, which is deployed in Vietnam. This highly mobile fire support weapon is organic to the Army's mechanized and armored divisions and armored cavalry regiments. First procured in fiscal year 1962, production has been continuous since that time.

Also planned are additional buys of the self-propelled 81-millimeter mortar carrier, M-125A1, a lightweight, armored vehicle for transporting the 81-millimeter mortar and crew, and the full-tracked light armored recovery vehicle, M-578, which is used to recover armored vehicles and self-propelled artillery in the 15- to 33-ton class.

Also to be procured are additional quantities of the transporter-launcher for the armored vehicle launched bridge, a vehicle designed to transport, launch, and retrieve a 60-foot scissor-type aluminum bridge. Additional quantities are also being procured of the full-tracked combat engineer vehicle, M-728, which is used by combat engineers for demolition, obstacle clearance, and construction support; it is equipped with a 165-millimeter turret-mounted demolition gun, an A-frame with winch, and a bulldozer blade. Both the M-728 and the AVLB transporter-launcher use the basic M-60 medium tank chassis.

These vehicles do not have the glamor of jet aircraft or nuclear submarines but they are a very important part of our total offensive capability.

Vietnam is on our mind but we should be aware that the Soviet Union is still our greatest threat and that country together with its satellites possesses something in the order of 90,000 tanks.

Another phase that drew my particular attention during our consideration of this bill was the increasing use of the C-130 aircraft in Southeast Asia and the necessity for additional aircraft. The committee is proposing, therefore, that the Air Force program be increased by the procurement of 25 additional C-130E aircraft.

This aircraft is basically a medium-size, four-engine transport aircraft capable of air delivery of personnel or material by parachute or landing as required. Special features in this aircraft include an integral ramp and cargo door, crew and cargo compartment pressurization, ground and in-flight air conditioning, thermal de-icing system, single-point refueling, and an excellent automatic pilot system.

The committee has examined the impact of continued hostilities in Southeast Asia. The increased daily utilization and employment of the C-130 aircraft in the combat environment of SEA results in greater attrition than originally pro-

jected. Also, due to the versatility of the C-130 aircraft, aircraft have been diverted from assignment to the tactical airlift role to satisfy high national priority missions.

The possibility of replacing the diverted C-130 aircraft in their special mission roles with other aircraft and returning the C-130's to the airlift fleet was examined. It was found that it is not only economically impractical to replace the modified C-130 aircraft committed to special mission accomplishments with substitute aircraft, but that there is no other aircraft available in the inventory which can meet the requirements as effectively as the C-130 type aircraft.

In conclusion, this bill speaks for itself and I know that it will receive prompt approval by the House. It is the result of long and detailed hearings and represents a most important step forward in achieving the necessary capability which the Nation requires.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my full support to H.R. 9240 and urge its immediate passage. In my judgment, this is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress each year, if not the most important.

The bill authorizes appropriations totaling \$21,435,032,000, the bulk of which is for the procurement of urgently needed aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other military hardware to keep our defenses at the high levels needed at this critical time.

Of particular concern to me is the authorization of \$377 million included in this bill for preproduction activities directed toward the deployment of an antiballistic-missile defense system. Unfortunately, the \$167.9 million the Congress appropriated last year for the purchase of items leading to the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system was not obligated and spent by the Department of Defense. The Armed Services Committee has indicated its strong support for the immediate procurement of long leadtime items necessary for the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system. The funds authorized in this bill, added to the amount made available in fiscal year 1967, and related items would give the Department of Defense \$734.9 million to move ahead with an antiballistic-missile deployment.

I am extremely hopeful that the Secretary of Defense will not delay any longer a decision to move forward in this area. This Nation cannot afford to procrastinate while the known enemy prepares. We cannot take a defense gamble that could result in annihilation of some of our cities and the loss of countless lives. As of now, we have absolutely no active defense against missiles. Our nearly 200 million people are left at the mercy of enemy nuclear weapons. Not only would the Nike X offer protection against actual nuclear attack, it would additionally serve as a safeguard against the threat of attack.

The expenditure of the funds made available in this bill for the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system does

not necessitate an immediate decision on the type of defense to be ultimately deployed. The decision could be reached later as to whether we desire to deploy the thin defense or a more extensive version.

It is ironic that the administration, which has not hesitated to spend huge sums of taxpayers dollars on expensive social programs, pleads high cost as a reason for recommending against the missile defense system which could save millions of American lives. I believe the American people are willing to pay for a missile defense system.

For 6 years now the administration has rejected repeated recommendations that the United States move forward in the development and deployment of such a system. In recent years, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously urged that this be done. It is of crucial importance for the United States to go ahead immediately with an antiballistic-missile system, particularly in view of the confirmed step-up of Soviet activities in ABM deployment.

Secretary McNamara has not proven himself to be an expert in all military evaluation. Yet he continues to dispute this basic point of national security and defense which is urgently recommended as vital by men possessed of great military knowledge. It is my earnest hope that the Secretary will give greater heed to the combined judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and that he will follow more closely recommendations made by them on military matters. Experienced professional military judgments are most essential in aiding the Secretary to arrive at the crucial decisions he must make.

I would emphasize that we are not unmindful of the great responsibilities which rest on those who must make the decisions regarding our defense against a nuclear threat. In fact, the very gravity of the decisions makes it imperative that military advice representing many years of experience be heeded.

Not too many weeks ago there appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer an editorial headed "Is McNamara Making His First Mistake?" The editorial summed up a discussion of whether the United States should build a missile defense system this way:

It was the early boast of Secretary McNamara that he hasn't made a mistake yet . . . Unless we soon acquire an effective anti-missile system, heaven help the United States. Defense Secretary McNamara's first mistake could be a beaut.

To that, I say "Amen." We have added an additional \$25 million to the authorization request for the advanced manned strategic aircraft program, and I strongly support this action. I have frequently expressed the opinion that it is imperative to expedite work on this program to develop a bomber follow-on to the B-52. The reluctance of the Secretary of Defense notwithstanding, I believe more than ever that it is a matter of great urgency to hasten the development of a new manned aircraft that can meet the optimum performance characteristics that the Air Force requires today.

The manned bomber deserves full part-

nership in our strategic arsenal because, among many assets, it forces the enemy to provide a very costly second type of defense, and it can attack mobile targets of uncertain location.

I might point out that I have from the very beginning disagreed with the DOD's decision to phase out the B-58, our only supersonic bomber. This decision is a perfect example of what we have cautioned against in the past, and that is unilateral decisionmaking by the Secretary of Defense without heeding the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I join with my colleagues on the committee in strongly and emphatically urging that, in the interest of our national security, the Department of Defense pursue the development of a manned bomber with much more interest and speed than we have witnessed to date. This is essential if we are to preserve the offensive striking power of the United States.

The passage of this important legislation will help provide the needed equipment to continue unrelenting military pressure on the enemy in Vietnam. We need swift and decisive action to win this unfortunate war, with intensified bombing of enemy territory to end it in victory in the quickest time possible. We must increase our operations by air and sea in order to mount a new peak of sustained assault.

The military should be given greater freedom of action in selecting strategic targets for our bombing program. This program has proved its value and effectiveness. Among other things, it has restricted infiltration, and has aided in the reduction of enemy initiative in the south.

In my opinion, there is nothing that the Communists respect more than strength. We are the strongest Nation in the world militarily. The procurement authorized by this legislation will enable us to retain our strong military posture.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. Pelly. Mr. Chairman, I am impelled to state for the RECORD that I am strongly opposed to one expenditure which would be authorized in H.R. 9240. I refer to the inclusion of two fast-deployment logistics ships which, as projected, would probably cost \$50 million each.

Frankly, I do not often given the Senate credit for having exercised better judgment than the House. To me, however, this was certainly the case when the other body knocked out the entire program, including authorization for two other of these costly vessels which had been previously approved.

At least the House Committee on Armed Services has made it plain it was not endorsing the entire project of 30 of these ships at a cost of more than \$1 billion. But, I am opposed to any or all of them.

We have a lot of compromises around Capitol Hill. This is one entangling the spending of money that should be going into the construction of privately owned and privately operated ships. Secretary

of the Navy Nitze justifies this program because of its modernizing influence on private shipbuilders. He says the Navy can provide, by example, a useful contribution toward an effective maritime policy. He looks for the FDL program to show American shipbuilders how to cut costs and solve their difficulties.

In this connection there has been some talk of one city providing a tax-free site for the new yard to build these ships. That is the poorest way to save money I know. It would immediately force tax-free port districts all over the country to protect their private, taxpaying shipyards from this unfair competition. I certainly hope no such offer is accepted.

As for saving money, private enterprise does not have to look to the Navy or to Government yards for ideas on modernization. Give any private shipbuilder an order of sufficient ships to operate on a production-line basis, and he can save money too.

All I can say is that I hope the Senate stands firm and knocks the whole fast deployment logistics ship project out. If the House-Senate conferees compromise on a two-ship program or accept the four-ship program, there will be no saving. The answer will be great pressure next year on Congress to relent. It will be argued to justify the money spent on a new yard and for a limited number of ships, it is essential to expand the program.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara stubbornly keeps insisting, as he has throughout the years, that our merchant marine is adequate. Now he wants to provide his own cargo ships. When the Vietnam war is over, what will happen to these McNamara supply ships? I don't know, but I would feel better if they were privately owned and could help carry our American commercial cargoes and help with our balance of payments.

Secretary Robert McNamara wants to build ships like automobiles and airplanes on a production-line basis, but meanwhile, the administration cuts back on the number of ships to be built. Is there any sense to such inconsistency? I think it is absolutely ridiculous.

Americans know the techniques that are used by lower cost foreign shipyards. They know the techniques which the Secretary of the Navy supports for use in a 30-ship FDL program.

How much cheaper, Mr. Chairman, to have the Maritime Administration call for bids on a production-line basis for private shipyards and for private ship operators.

I favor keeping the Navy out of the merchant marine business. Let us maintain a fourth arm of defense for war or for peace that is a formidable fourth arm. This poorly considered FDL item should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the House Armed Services Committee in recent years has strongly supported the accelerated development of the advanced

manned strategic aircraft—AMSA—as a follow-on bomber to replace the aging B-52G and B-52H fleet in the mid-1970's.

The Air Force continues to believe that AMSA is one of its most pressing needs if it is to maintain an effective strategic deterrent in the years ahead. The committee joins that service in the belief that further delay in the development of this aircraft is a calculated risk which we cannot afford to take. The concept formulation phase being essentially complete, the best timing for contract definition appears to us to be now.

Last year an additional \$11.8 million was authorized and appropriated over and above the \$11.0 million requested in the Department of Defense budget for the Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation appropriation to initiate contract definition during fiscal year 1967.

The Air Force budget submission to the Secretary of Defense presented a total program for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968 of \$69.8 million with system contract definition to begin in July 1967 and to be completed in June 1968. This program required financing of \$22.8 million in fiscal year 1967 and \$47 million in fiscal year 1968.

The current Air Force proposal also contemplates a total 2-year, fiscal year 1967-68 program of \$69.8 million. This consists of an approved fiscal year 1967 program of \$18.8 million and a proposed fiscal year 1968 program of \$51 million. It contemplates the initiation of system contract definition on July 1, 1967, with completion in June 1968. This would still permit a first wing operational capability in the mid-1970's. This program therefore requires an additional \$25 million in authorization and appropriation for fiscal year 1968.

The OSD currently approved program for the 2-year period—fiscal year 1967-68—of \$44.8 million, with no provision for funding system contract definition, would have the practical effect of delaying contract definition by 1 year and consequently delaying the initial operational capability by 1 year.

In presenting this bill, the committee reiterates its previous position and strongly recommends the addition of \$25 million in fiscal year 1968 authorization to support earliest initiation of contract definition for this program.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9240 and I urge its speedy passage by this House as reported by our committee.

Our distinguished chairman and other members of the committee have given a very lucid and persuasive description of the details of this bill.

The chairman has indicated, and others I am sure will state, that we held long and detailed hearings on this bill. We examined every element of it and there were literally hundreds of these elements. Much time was devoted to its consideration.

The bill is in a large measure a reflection of the requests made by the executive branch. Our disagreements with

it were small in total amount. It is the committee additions which are a most significant improvement to the bill.

The committee added a net of \$368.6 million to the bill. Of particular significance are the committee additions pertaining to aircraft.

The committee added a number of EA-6A aircraft to the bill on the basis of highly detailed and impressive testimony presented by the Marine Corps. Testimony indicated that the Marine Corps urgently requires additional EA-6A's to provide for attrition and to replace obsolete EF-10B electronic warfare aircraft in Vietnam. The EF-10B lacks the capabilities of the EA-6A, and the expiration of its service life will deplete the EW aircraft inventory below Marine Corps requirements commencing in fiscal year 1968. These additional EA-6A's will bridge the gap between the loss of the EF-10B's and the introduction of the EA-6B in fiscal year 1971.

Testimony indicated clearly that C-130E aircraft are required, first, to provide replacements for C-130's diverted from airlift to high national priority assignments; and second, in the airlift forces for command support, for attrition, and to fill squadrons not fully equipped.

The Air Force requested the procurement of C-7A aircraft as attrition replacements on the basis of anticipated losses in Vietnam and losses due to normal attrition. The Air Force request was disapproved by the Secretary of Defense but the committee feels that there is a clear need, based on testimony received, for these aircraft.

Regarding the CX-2, testimony revealed to the committee's satisfaction that there is a real requirement for these aircraft to modernize the fleet of aeromedical evacuation aircraft which now consists of C-131 and C-118 aircraft. The committee wishes to note that it believes that these aircraft should be procured from U.S. sources unless, as is wholly unexpected, foreign aircraft prove themselves to be superior.

On the subject of aircraft modification, here again the request of the Air Force for authority and funds for aircraft modifications was denied by the Secretary of Defense. The committee is in complete disagreement with the Secretary of Defense with respect to this deletion and feels that as a result of experience in Southeast Asia this authority should be available to the Department of the Air Force. The modifications will include improved electronic equipment for fighters to give better penetration capability, greater bombing accuracy and to provide better offensive and defensive jamming.

Turning now to a matter which was somewhat controversial, and which has been described as the fast deployment logistic ships, this Member was not in complete agreement with the concept of the FDL program. I believe such ships would be highly vulnerable unless given protection. At the very best, they should be kept in U.S. ports and capable of deployment at high speeds. Under such a program fewer ships would be needed. I am not in favor of a 30-ship program. There was a request for five this year,

and our committee approved two. I hope it is very plain that we have not committed ourselves beyond the approval of these two FDL ships. There were many problems raised in connection with the FDL ships, such as their use in point-to-point shipping in competition with our merchant marine.

There was also an argument that these FDL's would be built by companies that were primarily aerospace companies who just very conveniently did go out and acquire a shipyard, and then just as a matter of further convenience became shipbuilders because they happened to get a shipbuilding contract. In our opinion this is wrong. These contracts should go to the old shipbuilding companies, and thus through the expenditure of these Federal funds such companies would be able to rehabilitate and modernize their shipyards in order that they might compete with the more modern foreign shipyards. We are looking toward the day when we might be able to spend more money on modernizing our merchant marine.

I do not have the exact figures, but the United States ranks way below some of the other countries in the world today in merchant ship construction. This is not good enough for a great country such as ours. In my opinion, the authorization of the two FDL's may give us a chance to test the FDL concept. Let us hope that old shipbuilding companies will submit proposals, other than the three aerospace companies who have submitted proposals, and that the old shipbuilding companies may find themselves qualified to build on the designs submitted by these aerospace companies. Surely some of the old companies can meet the price competition, and would be able to accomplish the desired modernization of our own U.S. shipyards.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things about this procurement bill which we would have preferred over that which was adopted. I refer to the argument about the so-called "thin" deployment of the antiballistic-missile system or the Nike X. We are talking about preventing a new arms race with the Soviets. It is my opinion that it is probable these negotiations may be fruitless. If that happens, we may have to embark upon not simply a "thin" deployment, but go to what has been described as "posture A" or "posture B," which is a heavy defense and which will protect most of our cities. The cost of a missile defense system may be several billion dollars, but it could reduce American fatalities from 120 million in an all-out exchange to as few as 30 million fatalities. There may be some advantages of beginning with a thin deployment, but it is my opinion that we should proceed toward meeting the defense needs of this Nation and fully protecting it against missile attack by any hostile nation. In other words, as to the proper level of Nike X deployment it is my belief it should be one that will protect not just a few of our cities but all of our cities. We should spend dollars to save lives, if by the expenditure of these dollars we can be afforded protection for the whole country.

I have no doubt that the House today will approve this authorization bill, perhaps unanimously. If they do, it will show they have a clear awareness of our defense problems. It will show they have a clear determination to protect our freedom.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding to me. I should like to pose some questions.

The committee report states on page 10 that none of the \$30 million authorized for contract definition of the DXG types of ships should be used for design of any major fleet escorts not powered with a naval nuclear propulsion plant. Is this statement, Mr. Chairman, sufficient to insure that the Defense Department cannot use any of these funds for the design of a nonnuclear major fleet escort?

Mr. RIVERS. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is just as the gentleman stated: They must have nuclear propulsion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I thank the chairman. One further question. The bill before us provides two nuclear guided-missile frigates. I want to congratulate the chairman on that provision being in there. These are a substitute for the two non-nuclear-powered destroyers requested by the Department of Defense in this year's shipbuilding program. The question is, once this bill is passed, this substitution will have to be approved in conference. To what extent can we, the Members of the House, be assured that the House conferees will take a strong stand on this and will not accept any compromise? In other words, to what extent could we be assured that the language in the bill before us today will stand, requiring that not zero, not one, but two nuclear-powered frigates be contracted for as soon as possible? Can we be assured there will be a strong stand made on that?

Mr. RIVERS. Last year we came from conference with the provision that these ships shall be constructed unless the President certifies to the Congress fully it is not in the national interest. To answer the gentleman, we will insist on the language we inserted in the bill in conference last year and which is now the law of the land.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee having responded to two questions which I have asked, and I understand the answers to these:

Yes, the Secretary of Defense must not use the \$30 million DX/DXG funds for nonnuclear ships.

Yes, the Defense Department must build not zero, not one, but two, DLGN's as soon as practicable under this authorization. I appreciate, further, the chairman having clearly stated that he will insist on these provisions in conference with the other body.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that you and your committee deserve great credit for the initiative that you are taking in clearly expressing the will of Congress that this Nation shall have a nuclear powered Navy. In my experience in this body, I have found a deep seated conviction supporting the construction of nuclear powered submarines and surface combatant ships. I have found the same conviction among the American people. It is true that at the present time they cost slightly more, but, according to the committee report, the Chief of Naval Operations has himself said that nuclear powered task forces would save lives because of the increased effectiveness of such forces and their greater independence from supply. This in itself is enough reason for me. This in itself is enough reason for the Congress. And this is enough reason for the American people.

Now, to get down to just one specific example.

On page 7 of the committee report there is reference to a letter from the captain of a nuclear attack submarine which had been assigned to attack a conventional aircraft carrier during fleet exercises. The report states:

He made several successful attacks when the carrier had slowed down to conserve fuel.

I note on page 1780 of the record of hearings that the letter referred to has been deleted, since it apparently contained classified information. However, the record states that the classified letter brings out the reduced vulnerability to submarine attack of nuclear warships because such ships do not have to run at slow speeds to conserve fuel or to refuel.

I have had some experience in this matter myself. I fully concur with the committee pointing out the reduced vulnerability of nuclear powered surface warships to submarine attack because of their ability to steam continuously at high speed as one prime reason for insisting that all future major fleet escorts be nuclear powered. Any submarine commander will tell you that the capability to steam continuously at high speed—which can only be obtained through nuclear propulsion—is an important factor in reducing the vulnerability of surface ships. A conventional ship lumbering along at slow speed to refuel or to conserve fuel is a sitting duck.

There is no question that the Russians are building a large nuclear submarine fleet. Only nuclear powered warships will have the endurance to outrun or outchase their nuclear subs, not for just a few hours, but for weeks on end. We must see to it that any new major surface warships we build are given the added protection afforded through nuclear propulsion. It is wasteful—indeed it is dangerous—to do otherwise.

Thanks to Admiral Rickover, we have several years advantage in nuclear propulsion. Let us not fritter away this advantage.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 9240, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill includes an authorization of \$377 million for continued

development of the Nike X. Moreover, the Armed Services Committee in its report—House Report 221—states:

The committee strongly believes that the thin deployment would be a useful step toward meeting the defense needs of the Nation in protecting against ballistic missile attack from any hostile nation.

I strongly support the minority views of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI], who point out:

At the present time the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in extremely complicated and sensitive negotiations seeking to limit in some meaningful and responsible manner a major new round in the continuing cycle of increased armaments and increased spending for armaments.

The minority views go on to indicate that the committee statement is not in keeping with the effort to negotiate as the committee "regardless of the outcome of these negotiations" endorses an antiballistic-missile system.

I believe that the minority report does us a service by objecting to the committee's purpose. Will the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system increase our security? In his testimony before the committee Secretary of Defense McNamara, in answer to a statement by Mr. Hardy who said:

I get right concerned about the number of people that are going to be obliterated by that first attack, in the absence of any ABM system. And I would, too, if an ABM system would reduce the number that would be killed by their attack. But I don't see any way to deploy an ABM system with that result.

The Secretary of Defense also pointed out that the deployment of an ABM system would put a premium on the further development of offensive capability and stated:

I don't believe the deployment of an ABM system in an attempt to protect our population against a Soviet attack would strengthen our deterrent in the slightest degree.

We are now at a critical stage. If the present negotiations with the Soviet Union fail and we then deploy an ABM, it may very well provoke a major arms race which will not only be enormously costly but will greatly increase tensions and lead to further instability. It should be understood clearly that a vote on this bill in no way binds the Congress to any ABM system and in no way should be construed to be in support of such a proposal.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, the committee's addition to H.R. 9240, the weapons procurement and research and development bill, of title IV which changes the present period of appointment of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was objected to by the Department of Defense. The objections of the Department, which I consider to be worthy of real consideration, were not included as a matter of record during the consideration of the bill.

I therefore am setting out below the full text of the letter dated May 8, 1967, from Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance indicating the views of the Depart-

ment with respect to this new and, so far as the Department is concerned, unwanted language in the bill relating to the Joint Chief of Staff.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask that these remarks on the letter be set out at the conclusion of that portion of the debate relating to title IV. The remarks follow:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the bill as reported by the Committee, a new Title IV has been added to H.R. 9240, 90th Congress, a bill "To authorize appropriations during the Fiscal Year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes."

I am taking the liberty of writing this letter in order that you may have the views of the Department of Defense on this new subject matter. Sections 401 through 404 of Title IV would amend sections 3034(a), 5081(a), 8034(a) and 5201(a) of Title 10, U.S. Code, to provide that the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Commandant of the Marine Corps, respectively, shall each be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period or term of four years. They would serve during the pleasure of the President and would be eligible for reappointment only in time of war or of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress. These amendments would change the present law which permits terms of not more than four years of office for the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations. Additionally, they would restrict the President's power to reappoint these officers and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In essence, therefore, Title IV of the bill is similar to the legislation proposed in 1963 by H.R. 6600, 88th Congress. In expressing its opposition to H.R. 6600, the Department of Defense stated its views that the President, in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief, should retain a reasonable degree of flexibility in his choice of those to serve as his principal military advisors. The Department also expressed its belief that the existing statutory provisions had proven satisfactory and that no basis appeared for a change in the terms of appointment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Department believes that experience since 1963 with the operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system confirms the appropriateness of the present statutory pattern and establishes that no change is necessary. We do not believe that, in any instance, the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense or the Congress of the United States has been deprived of the free and independent judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on military matters. We believe it would be unwarranted and unfair to the distinguished officers who have served in this capacity to convey through such amendment the unintended, but unavoidable, implication that they have in any way suppressed their genuine views or compromised their professional judgments in order to win reappointment.

As a practical matter, moreover, the proposed amendments do not appear likely to achieve the Committee's purpose of assuring a free flow of expert military advice. For such advice to be effective, each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff must enjoy the full and complete confidence of the President. Where this relationship of confidence does not arise,

the rigidity of a four year term would confront the President with the alternatives of losing a significant part of the military counsel which Congress intended that he have or of subjecting a distinguished military officer to the stigma of dismissal.

In summary, we believe that the experience of four Presidents over almost two decades has revealed no compelling reasons for the proposed change and has abundantly confirmed the wisdom of preserving the present system. Accordingly, the Department of Defense reaffirms the views expressed with respect to H.R. 6600, 88th Congress, and urges the deletion of Title IV of H.R. 9240.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, it has long been the established policy or position of the Congress that our military forces should have a balanced capability. To me, that balanced capability includes the unmanned missile systems and manned strategic, as well as tactical bombers.

While I am a junior member of the Committee on Armed Services—this is my first year to serve on that important committee—I was greatly impressed by the testimony presented by the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force on the advanced manned strategic aircraft and the review of past history presented to the committee by our staff on the AMSA.

On the basis of the information presented to the committee, I am convinced that the FB-111, which some propose as a replacement for the B-52 bomber, will be merely an interim replacement and will not be able to reach some of the targets now within reach of the later model B-52's, G's and H's. This lack of capability to meet the total requirement for a manned bomber to supplement our missile capability clearly indicates the need for a more advanced system which the Air Force identifies as AMSA.

The reluctance on the part of the Secretary of Defense to approve the development of such an aircraft appears to be his lack of conviction for such a system and his skepticism of the design proposals submitted to date.

The question before the Congress is not how many AMSA's we authorize for construction or the adequacy of the operational capabilities sought by the Air Force. The funds requested in the fiscal year 1968 research and development budget of the Air Force would merely support the contract definition phase of the development program. It is estimated that this phase would require approximately 1 year. During that time, Air Force contractors will recommend the design and operational characteristics of the most optimum aircraft possible within a certain time frame. Also, during the contract definition phase cost information can be developed which will enable the Department of Defense and the Congress to know what the total cost of a programed force of advanced manned strategic bombers will be. The approval of funds for the contract definition phase is not a release for production and deployment of a system. It is a development stage at a lower cost that enables us to make wise decisions relative to later production and deployment.

In testimony before the Congress, rep-

representatives of the Department of the Air Force stated that:

The Air Force continues to believe that an Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft is one of its most pressing needs if it is to maintain an effective strategic deterrent in the years ahead. Our experience in Vietnam has also shown us that the AMSA would be of significant value in limited wars by virtue of its large internal payload of non-nuclear ordnance which is nearly double that of the B-52.

Mr. Chairman, as noted by the Congressman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], this was the only item in the total defense research and development budget that was changed by the Committee on Armed Services. I believe the urgent requirement of the Air Force for this system well justifies the funds authorized in this bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend our Committee on Armed Services, and particularly its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for the recognition it has given in its report on the bill, H.R. 9240, of the current deplorable condition of the American merchant marine. I heartily endorse the committee's view that an approved program be submitted by the Department of Defense with respect to a strengthened American merchant marine.

However, I am constrained to express my regrets over the action of our Committee on Armed Services in providing authority for the construction of four fast-deployment logistics ships: the two which were authorized in fiscal year 1966 plus two for fiscal year 1968. The construction of these so-called FDL ships has been and continues to be a matter of deep concern to me. What bothers me most is the apparent lack of factual data concerning the construction program itself, its possible effects, and even the specific mission of this proposed new class of vessel.

As I stated only last month when appearing before our Committee on Armed Services, I have no objection to the construction of two prototype FDL ships. But to authorize the construction of more than two of these ships would serve no productive purpose whatsoever and are not actually required for combat military operations just seems to me to be a tremendously lavish and costly program. This is especially true at this time when our budget is being heavily taxed by extraordinary demands both at home and abroad, coupled with the fact that what appears to be the stated task of these FDL ships could perhaps be accomplished far more economically by a reasonable and adequate promotional program for the American Merchant Marine which could serve both the country's economy and its military requirements. Therefore, I am disappointed in this action recommending an authorization for appropriations to construct not two but four ships of this new and as yet unproven class of vessel.

Now, it is my understanding that to construct these four FDL ships will require an expenditure of \$199.4 million in addition to the \$67.6 million of unobli-

gated funds authorized in fiscal year 1966 for a total of \$267 million. Certainly, when we have not even received the final design for these FDL ships, such an expensive undertaking does seem to me to be both untimely and extravagant when it goes beyond an experimental program.

In March of this year, the Senate acted upon the military authorization bill and disapproved the construction of these FDL ships, including the \$67.6 million of unobligated funds previously authorized in fiscal year 1966. The reason cited by the Senate Committee on Armed Services in its report was that:

The committee is unconvinced that a program of such cost is justified.

Frankly, I am equally concerned about the lack of justification for the construction of the four FDL ships, especially when there appears to be no agreement on even the most basic issue of the cost of this construction program. Therefore, when this measure goes to conference, I hope the Senate's view on this matter will prevail to the extent that only two prototype FDL ships are authorized for construction.

Although our Committee on Armed Services in its report makes it crystal clear that in recommending the construction of the four FDL ships it does not commit itself to approval of a larger number of these vessels, I still entertain serious reservations over the open-ended cost aspect of this program. Perhaps this is owing to the fact that I have a vivid recollection of a similar proposal of the Secretary of Defense in the development of the TFX aircraft now renamed the F-111. As recently as last month in an issue of the New York Times Magazine, an article by Mr. Richard Witkin, entitled "Why the Flak Around the F-111," concluded with this observation:

As for McNamara, despite all his brilliance he is emerging in the F-111 dispute as a merely human, fallible policy-maker who compounded what appears to have been an initial mistake—commonality—by tactlessness and a presumptuous flouting of sound managerial doctrine.

I have no desire to witness a second such costly miscalculation by authorizing the construction of any more than two prototype fast deployment logistics ships.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on H.R. 9240, the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal 1968, with great interest—and with even greater concern and trepidation for what that debate portends.

Obviously many of the speakers have been deeply moved by their emotions in the consideration of this bill. Much of the time allocated to consideration of the rule and to the bill has been devoted to heated discussion of the limits of dissent in time of war, the excesses of those who are protesting the war, the burning and desecration of the flag, the picketing at the Pentagon, and similar matters only indirectly related to the bill before us.

The sentiment of most Members with regard to the programs authorized by the bill has probably been represented as well by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi, as by anyone else. He has made it clear that if the bill were for

\$221 billion, rather than \$21 billion, he would still vote for it and urge its passage. Under these circumstances we may count the action of the Armed Services Committee in recommending only a third of a billion dollars more than requested by the President as the height of moderation. The gentleman from Mississippi and others did point out, of course, that we could expect to vote for as much as another \$10 billion in addition to the \$75 billion of new obligational authority contained in this bill and other existing legislation for use by the Pentagon in 1968. We may expect, in other words, to spend \$85 billion or more on defense in fiscal 1968.

The language of the report on this bill also makes it clear that the committee is urging the Defense Department to move far more aggressively in the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system than it is now doing. It considers that the economy model "thin deployment" at the bargain price of only \$4 billion would be only a "useful first step," leading to the more sophisticated systems at prices from \$20 to \$40 billion. In view of the committee's expression I welcome and commend the minority views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] who alone on the committee seem to realize the enormous consequences of the proposed action, and counsel a degree of moderation.

When we, as Representatives of the people of these United States, are confronted by a bill authorizing \$21 billion—and that bill only a portion of a program calling for \$75 billion—and that program probably to be later expanded to \$85 or \$90 or \$100 billion—and we are asked to give it rational consideration in 3 hours, in an atmosphere charged with the most intense emotion, we are asked the impossible. To make a few comparisons, the total moneys spent on defense next year may well exceed that of any year in the history of the United States. It may well exceed the total Federal administrative budget of any year prior to 1960. It may well exceed the total of all money spent by the U.S. Government from its founding until the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And do the Members of this Congress seem to be concerned? Are they worried about the policies of this country which produce this astronomical demand for defense authorization? Do they feel better defended, more secure, than they felt last year, or 20 or 50 years ago? The answer to all of these questions is obviously "No."

I feel that perhaps my only contribution to this debate may be to ask the Members of this body to pause and consider what they are doing. We are emotional. Most of the speakers have said that we are at war. The words "treason" and "disloyalty" have been used to describe those who protest over our involvement in Vietnam. Considerable time has been taken by able and distinguished Members of this body to explain the real meaning of their statement that we should forget the first amendment to the Constitution.

All of this is, in my opinion, an exer-

cise in self-deception. We all know that the Constitution clearly says that Congress shall declare war—and it has not. We all know that treason is a crime that only exists in time of war. We have all joined in this House in a conspiracy to pretend that the Constitution has not been violated as we fight the third largest war in our history without any action by Congress to declare war. We have abdicated the constitutional role of Congress in this crisis. We have turned over to the President the complete power to direct the awesome forces of the most powerful nation in the history of mankind. And we are understandably frustrated that all of the people of this country do not immediately fall into line, as we have the flag, as we cry treason, as we point with alarm to the pickets, the placards, the leaflets and the speeches that protest what we are doing. The protesters are becoming emotional too, for in most cases they, or their sons and loved ones, will be doing the fighting and dying in this war we in Congress have not declared, have not understood or justified to the American people.

I have no doubt but what a majority of Congress would be glad to resolve this problem by declaring war—as soon as the President directs them to. I have no doubt that many would clamor for a declaration of war before the President gave the word if we faced a major defeat in Vietnam or, for example, one of our major bases were wiped out by a missile attack. We would, of course, have to ask the President against whom we should make the declaration. If it occurred in the Camau Peninsula, where there are no North Vietnamese troops, would we declare war against the National Liberation Front—whom we do not recognize as a legitimate party to the conflict, worthy of equal rights at the negotiating table? Or would we declare war against North Vietnam, as the instigators of the deed? Or perhaps the President would tell us to declare war against Russia, which supplied the missiles and trained their crews. Or perhaps China, the real enemy, because it is their nefarious doctrine of “wars of national liberation” that we are really fighting, and the Russians are our friends—temporarily embarrassed into helping the enemy. I am sure that the President, ably advised by the Pentagon and the State Department, will have the solution to this thorny problem, and that we will accept his wisdom.

Should we not pause and consider where we are bound?

I have just observed on the news tickers a report that high military figures are now condemning the policy of gradual escalation practiced by the President as the path of moderation. It has obvious military defects. It telegraphs our punches. It allows vital installations to be moved and concealed. It permits the installation of massive defensive systems which vastly increase our casualty figures and our equipment losses. It only works if its assumptions are valid; namely, that the enemy will give up when he has been hurt a little. If the enemy will not give up—and we now begin to perceive that he might not—the better course is to wipe him out immedi-

ately, using whatever weapons are required, and save yourself the time and trouble of escalating gradually. This means that a successful choice of military strategy requires that we must understand the enemy—why he fights, how strong are his motivations, why he thinks he is right.

Apparently the Pentagon, the President and the Congress have never understood these things, just as we are rather vague as to how we got so deeply involved in this morass of a land war in Asia.

I must confess the deepest sympathy for the tragedy of the President—criticized by the military for not unleashing them against this poverty-stricken Asian nation—as we devote 3 hours to debating an authorization bill that commits this Nation to spending more for defense than the total gross national product of all of China and Southeast Asia combined. The President, in the name of moderation, has poured the vast resources of this country into an effort to rescue a hopeless situation, and is now criticized by his military advisers for taking the course most expensive in money, men, and casualties, and apparently less likely to succeed. It is indeed tragic.

The tragedy is more than the President's. This Nation has now become the captive of the military mind. We no longer have a diplomatic policy, only a military policy. Every other country is an enemy or a potential enemy. This does not exclude nations that may have been our allies a few years earlier. For the military mind, the only safe posture is to be prepared to meet all of those real or potential enemies with military might. No posture is completely safe if it considers only what a rational course would be for those enemies and potential enemies. We must consider also the condition that every enemy intended to accomplish our destruction and would use its present actual and future potential capacity to achieve that destruction.

This is the tragedy of the garrison state dominated by the military mind. All of this is done under the banner of national defense, of preserving freedom and democracy. It is unpatriotic and even treasonous to dissent from these demands of the military. After all, they exist only to protect us.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the greatest parliamentary body in the world, the nightmare I am describing is not in the future. It is here today. It dominates the debate, or what passes for debate, on this bill, and it will dominate the voting. I doubt that even a handful of Members will care to resist the course we are taking.

I choose to resist. I ask you to stop and think what is happening to this great country.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes \$21.4 billion for procurement of military equipment, together with research, development, test, and evaluation. This bill paves the way for the appropriations committee to appropriate \$75 billion for defense in fiscal 1968, an increase of \$17 billion over fiscal 1967.

The bill as reported to the House contains three provisions which were not re-

quested by the administration. The first is the “thin deployment” in the United States of the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile system. The President asked that such a decision be deferred until after the outcome of negotiations with the Soviet Union. I concur with the administration view.

Second, the bill establishes a 4-year term for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. While it is true that any member can be removed at the pleasure of the President under the new language, the net effect is to lessen the flexibility of the President in making his selections. The stated purpose of the amendment is to strengthen the position of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they are in disagreement with the civilian authorities. I do not find that at the present time our Nation suffers from too little military influence in our decisionmaking.

The third new feature in the bill is military assistance to Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. Traditionally these authorizations have come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have little reason to believe that the gradual erosion of the Foreign Affairs Committee's jurisdiction in these matters will lead to improved congressional supervision.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides authorization to finance an expanded war in Vietnam, both north and south. I believe that the administration has erred in its handling of the Vietnam war, that it has steadily lost its options, and has failed at any time to comprehend the reality of this war. The United States is being drawn into a broader war every month. This commitment far exceeds our national interest, and it doing incalculable damage to our Nation both at home and abroad. I do not find it possible, therefore, to vote for a measure which finances ever-expanding military operations.

I believe in a strong military posture for the United States. Moreover, I would unhesitatingly vote for those resources needed to supply the troops presently committed to Vietnam. Under certain circumstances I would vote the resources needed to support additional troops in Vietnam. These circumstances do not now prevail, and this bill is not limited to support of present levels of military activity. Therefore, in order to express my opposition to our present course, I shall vote “no.”

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise, not in opposition to H.R. 9240, but to express my support of this legislation with rather significant reservations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has previously alluded to a matter which also concerns me and I should like to explore it further and a little more in detail.

My concern is about the procurement practices of the Department of Defense. I should like to ask the Armed Services Committee and its distinguished chairman to give consideration to my concern and to mount an investigation of the procurement practices of the Department of Defense so that the Congress can be fully cognizant of the inadequacies which exist in Defense Department procurement negotiations, contracts, and auditing.

The Armed Services Committee has

full authority to do this under House Resolution 124 which passed this body on February 20 of this year.

If this concern about shoddy procurement practices were mine alone, I would not presume on the time of my distinguished colleagues to go into the question here. But it is not my concern alone, nor only the concern of the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

Rather it has been the concern for the past several years of the General Accounting Office and the Congress itself, including the distinguished predecessor of the estimable present chairman of the Armed Services Committee. And it should be the concern of every taxpayer in this Nation.

It should be the concern of the taxpayer because the annual procurement of the Federal Government amounts to \$46 billion—not just the \$21 billion being discussed today—and \$38 billion of that total amount is procured by the Defense Department. It is the taxpayer who pays this bill when he sends in his check with his 1040 return on April 15. None of us who pays income tax wants to pay any more than necessary. The Federal Government, when it purchases the equipment it needs to run a war or to operate this Nation, should also not want to pay any more than necessary.

To this end the General Accounting Office is established to see that the Government makes the best buys possible with the taxpayers' money. To this end the Defense Department 8 years ago promulgated regulations applicable to all its procurement activities. To this end the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee proposed legislation before the Congress which was passed unanimously. And to this end a distinguished Ohio newspaper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, recently devoted a series of articles to publicize the fact that the Federal Government has not always been getting the best buys for its money because it has been failing to observe its own regulations and laws.

Plain Dealer Reporter Sanford Watzman, in his series of articles on the inadequacies of the Defense Department procurement system, reviewed the history of the truth-in-negotiating law which the Defense Department should be observing:

Throughout the 1950s, GAO checked war contracts at random, repeatedly finding cases where some companies were inflating their cost estimates and then banking the extra money with their legitimate profits.

By 1959 the Pentagon was persuaded to promulgate a new regulation. Henceforth, companies would be required to certify that their cost estimates were based on information that was current, complete and accurate.

But GAO kept checking, and its findings were the same. In fact, the Pentagon was not enforcing its own regulation. In file after file examined by GAO there was no "truth" certificate.

At this point, Rep. Carl Vinson, D-Ga. (retired), then head of the House Armed Services Committee, decided that there ought to be a law. He introduced the first Truth-in-Negotiating Act in 1960 with GAO backing.

In essence, the Vinson bill merely sought to add the force of law to what already was demanded—theoretically—in the Defense Department regulation. The "truth" certificate

should be required by statute, Vinson insisted. Then perhaps Defense might then give it more attention.

But the Pentagon objected. It argued not only that legislation was unnecessary, but also that it would deprive procurement officials of the flexibility they needed to negotiate contracts. The Vinson Bill died in that session.

In 1962, Vinson again introduced it. Two more years of GAO reporting had given him more ammunition. This time the bill passed, 362-0 in the House and on a voice vote in the Senate.

Unanimous congressional passage of Public Law 87-653—the truth-in-negotiating law—should have resulted promptly in every negotiated Federal procurement contract including in that contract a certificate that costs and prices on which the contract was based were "accurate, current, and complete."

It has been 4 years since the passage of that legislation—and many billions of dollars of Federal procurement contracts since—but the GAO reports that the requirements of the law still are not being met by the Defense Department in many instances.

And so, today, I should like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Armed Services Committee, its distinguished chairman, and my colleagues in this Congress, the findings of two recent GAO reports which indicate that many procurement contracts negotiated by the Defense Department are being negotiated in direct violation of Public Law 87-653, thus permitting the possibility of gross profiteering on the expenditure of this \$21 billion and other funds appropriated by this Congress for Federal procurement.

I include the letters of transmittal of the GAO report on the "Need for Improving Administration of the Cost or Pricing Data Requirements of Public Law 87-653 in the Award of Prime Contracts and Subcontracts" of January 1967, dated January 16, and the GAO report on its "Survey of Reviews by the Defense Contract Audit Agency of Contractors' Price Proposals Subject to Public Law 87-653" of February 1967, dated February 15.

I urge the Armed Services Committee to do all in its power to see that the findings of these reports result in improvement in procurement procedures in the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, the letters of transmittal of the two reports follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 16, 1967.

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The accompanying report summarizes our findings on the need for improving administration by the Department of Defense of the cost or pricing data requirements of Public Law 87-653 in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts. Our review was directed principally toward an examination into the extent that agency procurement officials were requiring prime contractors and subcontractors to submit cost or pricing data and a certificate prior to the award of negotiated contracts as required by Public Law 87-653 effective December 1, 1962.

During fiscal years 1957 through 1966, we submitted to the Congress 177 reports disclosing that Government costs on negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts were increased by about \$130 million. The increased

costs resulted primarily from the failure of contracting officials in negotiating contract prices to obtain accurate, current, or complete cost or pricing data upon which to establish fair and reasonable prices. As a result of certain of these reports, the Congress enacted Public Law 87-653 to provide safeguards for the Government generally where competition is lacking.

The findings summarized in the accompanying report were disclosed by the first phase of our review of 242 negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts awarded to 85 prime contractors and 89 subcontractors after October 1964. This examination was performed at 18 military procurement agencies and 31 prime contractor plants during the period April 1965 to June 1966.

The second phase of our review, which is currently in progress, includes an evaluation of the practices of the military services in negotiating the prices of 127 of the prime contracts we reviewed in the first phase. These contracts were selected for further detailed review because of our findings that procurement officials had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by the contractor in support of significant cost estimates included in the contract prices. In this second phase of our examination, we performed examinations at 79 prime contractor plants during 1965 and 1966. Our findings on this review will be the subject of further reporting to the Congress in the near future.

We found that 185 of the 242 procurements examined in the first phase were awarded under requirements of the law and the procurement regulations for submission of cost or pricing data and a certificate that the data submitted were accurate, complete, and current. However, in 165 of these awards, we found that agency officials and prime contractors had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by offerors in support of significant cost estimates.

As a result, it appears that the certificate is not wholly effective since it may be impracticable to establish whether the offeror had submitted inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent data in instances where he had not identified the data he had certified. Further, the Government's rights under the defective-pricing-data clause required by the law to be included in these contracts may be impaired since in such cases it may be impracticable for the contracting officer to establish that erroneous data were relied on in the negotiation if data were not submitted or made a matter of record by the offeror.

We also found that, in the remaining 57 of the 242 procurements examined, agency and contractor records of the negotiation indicated that cost or pricing data were not obtained apparently because the prices were based on adequate price competition or on established catalog or market prices of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public.

Public Law 87-653 waives the requirement for obtaining certified cost or pricing data under such circumstances. However, the records of these awards did not contain an explanation by the contracting officials of why cost or pricing data were not required and the reasons for determining that the prices were based on adequate price competition or on catalog or market prices of commercial items. As a result, it could not be ascertained whether the bases for these determinations were consistent with criteria established in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

During our examination of subcontract awards, we found that prime contractors also had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted by subcontractors in support of significant cost estimates even though agency contracting officials were required, under negotiated prime contracts other than

firm fixed-price type, to ascertain that such data were being obtained. Therefore, there also appears to be a need for thorough reviews by agency administrative contracting officials to ensure that prime contractors are obtaining adequate cost and pricing data, where appropriate, in the award of subcontracts.

During our review, we found that agency officials in awarding prime contracts were not requiring prime contractors to use a new Contract Pricing Proposal Form (DD Form 633) dated December 1, 1964. This form contains instructions to offerors which, if properly implemented, could, in our opinion, go a long way toward achieving compliance with the procurement regulations implementing the law. The Department of Defense has now taken steps to correct this matter. However, during our review of subcontracts, we found that prime contractors were not being required to use the new form in obtaining proposals from their subcontractors.

We proposed that the Department of Defense clarify its procurement regulations to provide that, where cost or pricing data are required in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts, agency officials and prime contractors be required to obtain from offerors written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulations, in support of cost estimates along with certificates specifically covering the identified data and to retain such records in procurement files.

We proposed also that the prescribed certificate be revised to require the contractor to certify that a written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulation, provided or otherwise made available to the contracting officer or his representative in support of the proposal, has been submitted and that such data are accurate, complete, and current as of the date agreed upon by the parties (which shall be as close to the date of agreement on the negotiated price as is practicable).

Further, we proposed that the Department of Defense take appropriate actions to emphasize and clarify certain existing requirements dealing primarily with the application of Public Law 87-653 to the award of subcontracts and to ensure that agency and contractor officials are complying with them.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Procurement) advised us that a special group had been appointed under the guidance of his office to study all the material contained in our report. He assured us that the necessity of providing additional guidance on the subject of submittal and retention of data or identification in lieu of submittal will be considered. He indicated, however, that it was not possible to forecast the exact outcome of this study.

We have also completed a similar examination covering 138 contracts awarded by 15 offshore procurement agencies to prime contractors in Europe and the Far East. We have advised the Secretary of Defense of our findings which are essentially similar to those described above.

We also have submitted to the Department of Defense for comment similar findings stemming from our review at seven Army Corps of Engineer procurement offices in the United States and at six overseas locations of 195 contracts for construction work.

This report is being issued so that the Congress may be informed of the need for the Department of Defense to improve the effectiveness of its administration of the cost and pricing data provisions expressed by the Congress in the enactment of Public Law 87-653.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and to the Secretary of Defense.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 15, 1967.

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The accompanying report presents the results of a nationwide survey which we made in response to interest expressed by the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, in strengthening contract audit work in the Department of Defense.

Since July 1965 this audit work has been performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency, a new agency formed at the direction of the Secretary of Defense by consolidating various contract audit staffs formerly assigned to the three military departments.

We directed our attention to the Agency's responsibility for making reviews of contract pricing proposals negotiated without the safeguards of competition. These reviews, which are made prior to negotiation with the contractor, constitute a substantial portion of the Agency's workload and are accorded the highest priority.

Our survey included work at Agency audit sites at 20 plants of private companies generally among the top 100 defense contractors in the United States.

The Agency is making significant progress. But our survey showed that, in order to operate more effectively with its workload of many thousands of contract pricing proposals totaling over \$40 billion annually, improvements are needed in four areas, as summarized below.

1. Prices of most defense procurement contracts are based largely on estimated costs in proposals submitted by contractors as a basis for negotiation. Nationwide and individual reviews in recent years by military procurement and audit organizations—as well as current surveys by the Defense Contract Audit Agency—have disclosed a need for major contractors to improve and incorporate into a formal system their estimating methods and procedures. This would provide greater management control over the estimating processes used in preparing price proposals, and facilitate review and negotiation.

We brought this problem to the attention of top Defense officials in a preliminary report and in a special briefing. In January of this year, the Department released a Defense Procurement Circular, effective immediately, designed to attain a number of improvements, including:

Policy guidance to procurement officials and auditors.

Criteria for acceptable cost estimating systems.

Reasons why these systems benefit industry as well as Government.

Steps to be taken to correct present deficiencies.

This action by the Department is important and commendable. We are recommending in the report some steps to help carry out the new directive.

2. In a number of instances defense auditors did not review significant cost estimates in price proposals. This was due in part to a carryover of practices followed by former audit organizations when responsibilities for reviews of proposals were less than those currently specified in procurement regulations. The Department told us that actions are underway—or are planned—to correct this situation. We are recommending that the Secretary of Defense review these corrective efforts within the next year.

3. Defense auditors ordinarily were not receiving information from procurement officials on the usefulness of their audits in negotiations or on ways that their services could be more effective in future negotiations. The Department has acted on our proposal to provide this type of "feedback" to its auditors.

4. Defense auditors have experienced difficulties, when reviewing proposed contract prices, in obtaining what they considered to

be sufficient access to contractors' records. The Department informed us that new guidelines had been issued to help resolve these access-to-records problems. If this action is supported by continuous assistance from procurement officials, at all levels, it should improve the situation.

In a prior report to the Congress (B-158193, February 1966), we recommended that the Defense Department establish a regularly scheduled program to administer the defective pricing provisions required in certain types of negotiated contracts by Public Law 87-653—"The Truth in Negotiation Act."

This law provides for price adjustments in favor of the Government when it is found that established prices have been increased significantly because of defective data used in negotiations. A program for these reviews was established by the Defense Contract Audit Agency during 1966. Reviews have been initiated, and we plan to examine the progress of the program this year.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Secretary of Defense; and the heads of other agencies which make significant use of the services of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state my general agreement with the minority views of our colleague from New York [Mr. PIKE] and our colleague from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] which are included in the committee's report.

As Members know, I strongly opposed the inclusion last year of \$167 million for preproduction of the Nike X antiballistic-missile system. This money for preproduction had not been requested by the Secretary of Defense and its use had been resisted as unnecessary and dangerous by many leading scientists and engineers closely associated with the subject.

As before, I do not oppose the \$440 million included in this bill and defense budget for continued research and development of the Nike X system. I have voted repeatedly for the research and development work in this field which totals now some \$4 billion.

At this time in world history, though, as Mr. PIKE and Mr. NEDZI have noted in their views:

The United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in extremely complicated and sensitive negotiations seeking to limit in some meaningful and responsible manner a major new round in the continuing cycle of increased armaments and increased spending for armaments.

I think it is inappropriate for us, while these negotiations are going on, to proceed with the funds for construction and deployment of this system, as the committee has recommended. For let us be very clear, this "thin deployment," which would provide protection against an unsophisticated attack by the Red Chinese in the 1970's, is only a first step. The next step would be a defense against the more sophisticated Soviet missiles, and the ultimate cost of this program over a 10-year period, as estimated by Secretary McNamara, is in the order of \$40 billion.

Other questions need to be raised as well. They are discussed by Secretary McNamara in the committee's hearings and I urge a careful reading of his points. Fundamental is the question of whether

er the deployment of an ABM system at this time would improve our security. The Secretary has noted that the Soviet Union would be forced to react to a U.S. deployment by increasing its offensive nuclear force still further. The results, he suggests, are: one, the risk of a Soviet nuclear attack on the United States would not be further decreased; and two, the damage to the United States from a Soviet nuclear attack would not be reduced in any meaningful sense.

An ABM system would also require an extended fallout shelter program, but the political decision to proceed with such an extended system has not yet been made.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that the present negotiations with the Soviet Union will not lead to a treaty banning the development of anti-ballistic-missile systems. It may be that both countries, at some point, may need to develop a shield against the Communist Chinese. The budget, as recommended, already included \$375 million for production of the Nike X, should negotiations fail. I support the inclusion of these funds. I would also support a supplemental authorization and appropriation if such should become necessary.

But I believe that production and deployment at this time would be most unfortunate. There is a real question in the minds of many knowledgeable experts as to whether it would add to our security. It would certainly jeopardize the chance of successful negotiations that could be a meaningful step in turning down the arms race.

I would hope that this decision on actual production and deployment could be delayed until the need, or lack thereof, of such an expensive and potentially dangerous system could be more adequately determined.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important bill. It comes at a crucial time when our Nation is engaged in conflict in Vietnam and American boys are offering their lives and giving their all for the security of the Nation and the cause of human freedom.

There can be and will be little, if any, opposition to this bill, because it provides authority for the sinews, the materiel, the aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, combat vehicles, and other equipment, as well as the research, development, test and evaluation, so vital and indispensable to the struggle for liberty, independence, and world peace that this Nation is presently carrying on against Communist aggressors.

The able distinguished chairman of the committee, our esteemed friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has summarized the bill with his usual clarity, knowledgeability, and persuasiveness. He has, to my mind, in his eloquent, forceful way, presented an irrefutable case for the bill, and so has my dear friend and esteemed, able, dedicated colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

There is little that can be added to stress the reasons that make the speedy enactment of this measure by the House definitely imperative.

This bill is very necessary now in the

public interest and for the security of the country.

The cost of national defense is very high in terms of dollars, since this year we will spend something like \$73 billion, a truly astronomical amount.

However lamentable it may be that the Nation must provide such huge outlays for military purposes, it is clear that not to do so could well have disastrous consequences to the Nation and the world. But we must insist on every measure of economy, efficiency, and accountability.

Let us hope and pray that through our strength, our firmness, our spirit of resolution, and our unyielding purpose to defend our country, preserve our heritage, support the cause of freedom, and do our utmost to speed the peace, we may soon be able to achieve peace in Vietnam, and elsewhere in the world.

I am in strong support of the bill and would like to touch briefly upon an improved operational measure in behalf of our military personnel.

The committee has evidenced great interest in the aeromedical evacuation job being done by the Air Force in Southeast Asia. While that service is performing praiseworthy service, our analysis indicates additional resources are required to transport the wounded from the overseas port of entry to hospitals throughout the United States.

The CX-2 aeromed aircraft is the medium-sized jet transport needed to modernize the domestic aeromedical fleet for this mode of transportation.

During our review of last year's budget, it was brought to the committee's attention that the older prop-driven C-118 and C-131 aircraft currently performing the domestic transport missions were resulting in transfer times within the United States of longer duration than it was taking to bring our casualties from overseas. To help this situation, the Congress added four CX-2 aircraft to the fiscal year 1967 program. The bid proposals are currently being completed and the procurement is planned for July of this year.

To continue the necessary modernization of the domestic fleet, the Air Force has requested four more CX-2 aircraft in the fiscal year 1968 program. However, a minimum of 12 aircraft are required to completely replace the C-118's and C-131's with modern jets. By the addition of four more aircraft to the fiscal year 1968 procurement, the total requirement will be realized a year sooner. Maximum benefits will be obtained at the earliest date while precluding a possible break between delivery of the first eight and the follow-on aircraft. Completing the buy with fiscal year 1968 funds would also eliminate an additional year's operation of a mixed fleet which is always more expensive and less efficient since both old and new equipment would have to be used in combination.

Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt, unanimous passage of the bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no

further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, \$768,700,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$2,527,100,000; for the Air Force, \$5,770,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, \$769,200,000; for the Navy, \$625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, \$23,100,000; for the Air Force, \$1,343,000,000.

Naval Vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, \$1,872,900,000, of which amount \$249,600,000 is authorized only for the construction of two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates. The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: For the Army, \$424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, \$5,100,000.

TITLES II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, \$1,539,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$1,864,118,000;

For the Air Force, \$3,313,514,000, of which amount \$51,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

For the Defense agencies, \$464,000,000.

SEC. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1968 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, \$125,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 401 of Public Law 89-367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support (1) Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, (2) local forces in Laos and Thailand; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1968, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine."

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. Section 3034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of four years, from the general officers of the Army. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 402. Section 5081(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Chief of Naval Operations, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, for a term of four years, from officers on the active list in the line of the Navy, eligible to command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 403. Section 8034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed for a period of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the general officers of the Air Force. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 404. Section 5201(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Commandant of the Marine Corps, appointed by the President, for a term of four years, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, from officers on the active list of the Marine Corps, not below the rank of colonel. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 405. The foregoing provisions of this amendment shall take effect as of January 1, 1969.

Mr. RIVERS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 3, line 1, delete the figure "\$1,864,118,000;" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,910,118,000 of which sum \$46,000,000 shall be used only for antisubmarine warfare programs."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment. It is being offered on behalf of the members of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. This subcommittee was set up toward the end of the last Congress by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, because he was concerned, as we have been, with the increasing numbers of Soviet submarines and with the threat which they have represented. We have been concerned, too, with our attention focused so greatly on Vietnam, that this country not lose sight of the necessity for staying abreast of and, in fact, ahead of this Soviet submarine threat.

Members of our subcommittee were especially disturbed that the budget request submitted from the Department of Defense this year for research and development funds, particularly in the Navy, which had left out some \$46 mil-

lion of the sum originally requested by the Navy for research and development in the field of antisubmarine warfare, this \$46 million was deleted by the Department of Defense when the budget was submitted to Congress. Our subcommittee was concerned because antisubmarine warfare is one of the top priority items in the Navy. In response to a request from the subcommittee, Admiral Martell, the Navy's top official with respect to antisubmarine warfare matters, replied to us that elimination of this \$46 million would seriously impede our ability to continue research and development in a number of programs, some of which are classified, which are urgently needed to keep us ahead of the Soviets as we are at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I include the unclassified letter from Admiral Martell outlining the need for these funds.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF

NAVAL OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of 4 May 1967 as to my personal views as to the adequacy of the FY68 ASW RDT&E funds, I consider the present situation to be as follows:

I have repeatedly stressed that our present advantage in ASW derives from the superior technological effort of our Navy-Industry teams and that the improving ASW posture I have postulated for the early 1970's depends upon a continued high level R&D effort. Naturally, an adequate procurement program must follow but the R&D effort is indispensable in providing the edge between winning or losing encounters with enemy submarines.

The potential threat posed by the Soviet submarine force to our sea lines of communication is well documented. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union has continued to upgrade the capability of this force and indeed pursues those developments which provide great offensive capabilities, it is prudent that we also achieve the new capabilities which American technology can provide.

I share your concern for the need for additional R&D funds to accomplish this. This same feeling of concern has been expressed by others, including the Secretary of the Navy.

A strong ASW posture provides a strategic deterrent and damage limiting force of great importance. ASW forces will continue to be deterrent forces only as long as we maintain a capability for almost total destruction of any potential enemies' submarine force. The application of technology is the primary factor in assuring that we have viable forces to meet this goal.

As long as any potential enemy continues to upgrade his offensive submarine capability, the level of our ASW R&D effort must progress from year to year as each single new development contributes to building total capability. This is the only way to stay ahead in this deadly business. If there is merely a balance of capability, then there is strong temptation for an enemy to use the submarine as an offensive weapon at sea.

ASW forces can remain deterrent forces only if we have overwhelming ASW superiority. In my view, we urgently need additional funds in FY68 to apply to R&D efforts that will assure sufficient progress and this capability in the years to come. I state unequivocally that R&D is the primary area of

the ASW budget which poses a threat to achieving this ASW posture.

In each of the last several years I have identified ASW R&D funding deficiencies in the neighborhood of \$30-50M. In order to support the programs of highest ASW priority, and in the absence of adequate financial relief, I have sacrificed intensive effort on a number of other important ASW developments. I believe we must have a well-rounded body of ASW platforms, sensors and weapons, not a skeleton. I become most uncomfortable as I see these programs delayed another year because of inadequate funds. One project, for example, is the Extended Range ASROC weapon, capable of killing at ranges well beyond the present ASROC and beyond the submarine's attack range. Use of such a weapon could well provide the margin of victory in a Submarine-Escort encounter. I am simply unable to afford this development within the present funding envelope, even though its feasibility has been demonstrated and we are ready to proceed to engineering development.

While the ASW RDT&E Budget reflects some \$50M less than originally requested, new problems have arisen and information has become available since preparation of the budget that reaffirms the necessity for the original request. I have just concluded an apportionment review which indicated conservatively an urgent requirement for \$46M in FY68 above the amount budgeted. As I have indicated in Congressional hearings, the deficiency in ASW R&D has been passed on from year to year, and is with us still in FY68. It is difficult to describe precisely the effect of many of these deferrals and cancellations because they may not have a visible impact on our National Security for several years.

I see little, if any, possibility of obtaining funds for ASW from prior year monies or from the emergency or discretionary funds within the authority of the Secretary of Defense. Accordingly, I envisage that ASW deficiencies will continue to be accommodated by reprogramming within ASW unless additional funds are made available. In FY67 reprogramming within ASW amounted to over \$60M.

It has been my experience that whenever prior year assets are generated outside of ASW they usually are reapplied to urgent requirements that exist there. In like manner, whenever ASW prior year assets become available I reprogram them to satisfy ASW urgent requirements. With respect to discretionary funds, I find that the pressure of world events during the last two years has resulted in the utilization of these funds primarily for important new starts, for quick reaction R&D items for Vietnam or for other programs of great national urgency. As a matter of record, no such funding has been made available for ASW R&D over the past two years. So in my view, I am still faced with a current deficiency of \$46M in R&D funds.

I appreciate your concern and that of your Committee for our ASW readiness. I know you share with me the view that nothing less than complete technical supremacy in this field can meet the demand of National Security.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. MARTELL,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Director, ASW Programs.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, because of the very busy schedule of our full committee, it was not possible for our Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare to conclude its examination of these matters until after the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] had concluded its own hearings.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is my un-

derstanding that the gentleman from Illinois has no objection to this amendment, which is being offered on behalf of all the members of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee, an amendment designed to fill in a very substantial gap in our research and development programs in this field.

Let me just make very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the funds added to the bill by any amendment, the \$46 million, are in addition to those funds for anti-submarine warfare research and development already included in the bill. I want to make it clear that the language of the amendment is simply intended to insure that these additional funds not be reprogramed for any other purpose than ASW without the approval of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. STRATTON. I very gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] that this recommendation, then, is not only supported by the subcommittee to which the gentleman from New York has referred, but is also supported by the Department of the Navy's top officer in this field?

Mr. STRATTON. That is right. Admiral Martell has the full responsibility. Of course, as the distinguished chairman of our full committee indicated a moment ago, the personal views of Navy officers cannot be given to Members of Congress except in response to a specific question. Our subcommittee had submitted that question to Admiral Martell and he has replied to it in the letter which I have just presented.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I commend the gentleman from New York and support the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment represents a very urgent need for defense development funds. I do hope it will be approved.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and I wish to state to the Committee that I support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I say this in view of the fact that the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whom I have appointed as head of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee, has cleared this matter with the chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area in which there is reposed one of the most vital segments of our defense effort. If we have an Achilles heel, it is in the anti-submarine warfare defense program.

Mr. Chairman, I would much rather take the responsibility for accepting the amendment than that of rejecting it.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development is willing to go along with this amendment, and as

the top admiral in this operation has recommended, the committee has no objection to accepting the gentleman's amendment; in fact, we are very happy to accept it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and I appreciate his acceptance of our subcommittee's amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the very able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], and say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this is a matter that has had our urgent attention, not just recently, but for many months. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this is something which is vitally needed for our national security.

As for myself, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOW

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dow: On page 2, Line 10, strike out "\$1,872,900,000" and substitute "\$1,605,900,000."

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the sum to be authorized for naval vessels from \$1,872,900,000 to \$1,605,900,000. The difference, \$267,000,000, represents an authorization to construct four fast deployment logistic ships. This authorization should not be given. We gave an authorization for two of these ships in the 1966 fiscal year. My deduction would eliminate that authorization so that none of these FDL ships would be constructed.

Let me quote from a brochure issued by the Chief of Naval Material in October 1966. It explains these ships as follows:

The FDL Ship Project is a Navy program . . . to provide at minimum cost a fleet of ships for the continuous seaborne basing of United States land combat equipment in any area of the world. FDL ships will have the capability to disembark promptly the heavy equipment and initial combat supplies for land forces, if necessary in an over-the-beach operation.

These loaded ships, manned and operated by the Department of Defense, could be located at sea near potential trouble areas.

A later brochure of the Navy dated November 14, 1966, develops the intended use of the ships somewhat further. For example, it says:

They may move in irregular patterns in ocean areas near expected trouble spots: or be sited on neighboring ports.

In addition to our present instant capability on the sea and in the air, these

vessels would give us an instant capability overseas on the ground. They add an awesome new dimension to our military outreach.

It means, gentlemen, that we are rapidly backing to a de facto role as the world's sole policeman. We got into that role somewhat and altogether too much in Vietnam. Apparently the taste did not dismay us, for here we are eagerly seeking the complete role.

This thought was emphasized recently by Senator RUSSELL in a committee hearing of the other body. Senator RUSSELL had this to say:

That suggests we are going to be drawn into war in new places.

He went on:

If we build anything like this, we are just going to be handed more and more of this business of fighting everybody's wars everywhere.

The other body happily has eliminated the provision for these FDL ships.

The painful, tragic part of all this, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the decision to build these ships has been generated by the Defense Establishment, and not by Congress. Frankly, I wonder whether even Defense decided it. More likely they just fell themselves into the lure of doing something because it can be done, and not because it should be done.

The Navy brochure of November 14, 1966, lists 23 questions about the FDL ship program that "have been raised by the press, by individuals, by industrial associations and by Congressmen regarding various aspects of the FDL ship program." I think it is a national disgrace, and a congressional failure that not one of those 23 questions were the central ones that should be asked. Not one of them was the monumental question: "Should the United States be a world policeman?" Note that none of them was a second great question: "Should the United States prepare itself to crush all rebellions of underprivileged men in all quarters of the globe?"

The world is peopled by 2 billion hungry, deprived people, who are just lately realizing that opportunity is brighter for those who try. Shall we who are secure behind two oceans and arsenals of nuclear weapons send vessels thousands of miles in order to prevent the colored races from trying, at least, to struggle for a better way of life. If we take this negative stance in every quarter of the globe, I am not so sure that even the two oceans and the nuclear arsenals will ultimately protect us from the wrath of those with whom we interfere. I am not so sure that numbers may not in the end overpower our machines. Quite often right, and even God, Himself, has been on the side of the bigger battalion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, to argue or settle these questions here is beside the point. The point itself is this: How can we as intelligent, perceptive, patriotic, and wise representatives of the American people allow the highest kinds of policy to be established for us by a juggernaut in the Pentagon? How can we allow technicians of the shiploading craft to guide the juggernaut and lay down the policies of our Nation and the destiny of the world?

Has Congress abdicated? Are there in these halls where vision has been a tradition none who can perceive the salient issues? Perceiving them, are there no longer any who can ponder these issues in quiet, debate them in public, and master them in the end.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment before it is too late.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. In general debate, it will be seen that I have set forth my views in opposition to the construction of these fast deployment logistic vessels. I think possibly for somewhat different reasons than the gentleman's reasons. But I want to say to the gentleman, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to begin with we have done neither of the things to which the gentleman's remarks refer. We have rejected the notion that we build 30 fast deployment logistic ships. We have rejected the notion that they shall be tied up in foreign waters.

We have not accepted the notion that one shipyard will get 30 of these ships.

But we have insisted, Mr. Chairman, on the original position of building four prototypes. We are badly in need, and we are vitally in need, Mr. Chairman, of logistic support in this area. We need some kind of logistic ship. We put all kinds of guarantees in this bill to comply with the objections of the distinguished gentleman from Washington. We will not allow them to compete with existing ship companies and shipping lines. We will not let them be built if they are not necessary. They must come back and make a full report to the committee next year. The committee will then take a hard look at the entire proposal.

We have committed ourselves in the report. I do not think we should be the world's policemen.

We want to get some prototypes so that we can give our Army and Marines the supplemental logistic help that they need because we cannot give it to them with airplanes.

We know we need seaborne, logistic help and this is what the committee is endeavoring to do as we did 2 years ago without any objection.

I want to see what these ships look like. Then the committee will recommend to you what we will do with them. But to cut out the limited capacity recommended by the committee and the Congress needed for the prototypes of transportation facilities of men and materiel would not be wise.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I certainly want to commend the Committee on Armed Services for the way they have very carefully looked at this whole matter of this proposal and this program. It was actually because I recognized that the committee had done this, and the protection that

the chairman has indicated as to any future program, that I, myself, did not put in the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to say this. One reason that the committee acted as we have acted is because of the fine information and the intelligent opposition that we received from members of your distinguished Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We want to look at these things. We have committed ourselves to nothing. We want to see what they will look like because we need some kind of logistic ship, as the gentleman well knows. We do not plan to let them compete from point to point. We have rejected the notion of point-to-point use of these ships. These are purely and simply prototypes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. I want to say, I agree fully with what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said. If the Department of the Navy merely asked for two of these ships, there never would have been any question about it. The fact of the matter is, as the chairman so well pointed out, there is a shortage of logistical ships in the Navy today. The merchant marine has not kept up to date. This year, with 14 ships and the number of tons being built, this is not good enough for the United States, and will not sustain our naval forces to move overseas when the time and circumstances require the men and equipment that we need. So this is a small step that we are taking today, and I believe the Committee should approve it now as they approved it 2 years ago.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I might say that the existing shipbuilding companies are embarking upon a program now of trying to provide some kind of ship that would carry out a response to this type of need. Perhaps private industry will come up with something that we can use. But for the time being, we must move in the direction of at least seeing where we are headed in this area in which there is such a great need for logistics.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Let me thank the chairman for his patient explanation. I merely wish to say that in this debate we have concerned ourselves too much with the numbers of the ships and the technical details, whereas the point I was trying to make was that we need to take stock of our whole policy in the world, and it seemed to me that this was a point to close the door and say, "Here is where we will take such steps."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSH

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

"Sec. 203. It is the Sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible."

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to propose an amendment to H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

It is the latter part of the bill to which I would direct attention, that portion dealing with "Research and development."

Although not a member of the esteemed chairman's Committee on Armed Services, my interest has been elicited by my past experience in the Armed Forces myself, by my concern for our country's defense, its scientific development, and most recently my attention to research and development programs in the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I should like to propose an amendment, an inclusion to the present bill, which would put the Congress on record as favoring the geographical distribution of Federal funds for research and development whenever feasible.

May I explain the value of such an amendment, Mr. Chairman, by a history of this matter as it has concerned the committee of which I am a member?

Federal obligations for research and development are estimated at \$17.3 billion for 1968. New investment in development will decline, while funds for basic and applied research will increase significantly.

Expenditures for research and development comprise a substantial part of the Federal budget. In 1968, 13 percent of administrative budget expenditures will be for research and development. About two-thirds of the Nation's research and development effort is financed from Federal funds, and about 75 percent of the research conducted in universities comes from Federal funds. One of the chief recipients is national defense—which along with space and health objectives continues to comprise the major part of Federal research activities.

From time to time Members of Congress have expressed concern over the apparent imbalance of geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds. This concern is justified since the Federal research dollar affects regional economies, the availability of trained manpower, the quality and quantity of educational facilities for all ages of students, and the overall scientific and technological progress of our Nation.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which established NASA, called for scientific and technical competence of the country for work in aeronautics and space. However, it was in 1965 that the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics,

in its report No. 273 on the fiscal year 1966 NASA Authorization Act—Public Law 89-53, June 28, 1965—stated that:

Sec. 5. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end.

Similarly, the 1967 Authorization Act—Public Law 89-528, August 5, 1966—provided that:

Sec. 5. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

On September 14, 1965, President Johnson made a statement to the Cabinet and a memorandum for heads of departments and agencies on "Strengthening Academic Capabilities for Science," in which he noted that two-thirds of the total research expenditures in colleges and universities come from Federal funds and that:

The manner in which such funds are spent clearly has a most important effect upon advanced education in this country and upon the future of our Nation's universities.

The President also urged insurance—that our programs for Federal support of research in colleges and universities contribute more to the long-run strengthening of the universities and colleges. . . .

President Johnson remarked at that time that one-half of the Federal expenditures for research went to some 20 major educational institutions, most of which were strong before the advent of Federal research funds.

Compatible with their primary interests in special projects, agencies were urged to "find excellence and build it up wherever it is found so that creative centers of excellence may grow in every part of the Nation."

Since that time NASA has undertaken to follow the President's directives—and more. The principle and the goal of geographical distribution appears in authorization legislation. And, as of April 6, this year, the NASA procurement regulation has expanded the following stipulation about contracts to include those indicated in b—"existing contracts." The present NASA procurement regulation reads:

1.302-52 New source of scientific and technical competence

As a Government agency whose mission calls for substantial Federal expenditures and use of substantial national resources, NASA has a strong interest in assisting in the accomplishment of collateral national economic goals within the framework of applicable statutory and administrative authority in such manner as will not impair program effectiveness. Utilization and the accompanying development of the potential of all geographical regions in the space program will effectively contribute to achieving national goals. To advance the further de-

velopment of competence and capacity of sources, it is NASA's policy to encourage the placing of subcontracts over wider geographic areas. To carry out these objectives, the following development contracts of \$500,000 and over to be performed within the United States shall be inserted in all research contracts:

GEOGRAPHIC PARTICIPATION IN THE AEROSPACE PROGRAM

(a) It is the policy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to advance a broad participation by all geographic regions in filling the scientific, technical, research and development, and other needs of the aerospace program.

(b) The Contractor agrees to use his best efforts to solicit subcontract sources on the broadest feasible geographic basis, consistent with efficient contract performance, and without impairment of program effectiveness or increase in program cost.

(c) The Contractor further agrees to insert this clause in all subcontracts of \$100,000 and over.

b. EXISTING CONTRACTS. The "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause shall be included in existing research and development contracts of \$500,000 and over at the time the contract is modified.

At this point I should like to include a letter from James E. Webb, the Administrator of NASA, which explains in detail this procurement regulation and NASA's attention to geographical distribution of contracts with industry as well as with academic institutions:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: This letter replies to your inquiry, made when I appeared on February 28, 1967, before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, concerning what NASA has done in the past year to promote geographic distribution of Federal research funds.

We have developed a NASA Procurement Regulation Directive (PRD 66-8), "Development of New Sources of Scientific and Technical Competence," which became effective on September 1, 1966 (see Enclosure No. 1). This Directive requires inclusion of a "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause in all NASA research and development contracts of \$500,000 and over. Under this clause, the contractor agrees to use his best efforts to select his subcontractors on the broadest feasible geographic basis. Also, the contractor agrees to insert this clause in all subcontracts of \$100,000 and over.

This Directive has been revised (see Enclosure No. 2), effective April 6, 1967, to require the "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause, in addition to being used in new contracts, to be included in all existing NASA research and development contracts of \$500,000 and over.

The revised directive contains background material emphasizing the importance which Congress and, in turn, NASA place upon achieving maximum geographic distribution of Federal research funds.

To better measure the effectiveness of the program, our major contractors will be asked to submit to NASA an annual report of the specific methods being used or to be used to further implement the "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause.

We have actively pursued other aspects of our program. We are continuing to make available to concerns that have not participated in NASA research and development programs the benefits of new technology (discoveries, improvements, processes, innova-

tions) developed by NASA contractors. It is believed that this dissemination of new technology will increase the likelihood that more and varied sources will be able to undertake NASA research and development contracts. To further strengthen our new technology disclosure program, we now require contractors to specifically describe their proposed plan for new technology identification and disclosure in their proposals. Also, these plans are now evaluated when NASA considers proposals for award of a contract.

To assure availability of new technology to all sources, NASA has established local centers to provide rapid access to this information. Such centers have been set up in Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Missouri, North Carolina, Maryland, New Mexico and Oklahoma. In addition, NASA has entered into an agreement with the Small Business Administration, under which SBA personnel are specifically assigned the responsibility of finding small business concerns that can take advantage of NASA's Technology Utilization Program.

Specifically directed to greater geographic distribution is a recent change in NASA's practice of limiting to the local business community contracts for "on call" type services requiring quick response. Such geographic limitations have been replaced by time limitations. As a result, any qualified firms, regardless of location, are eligible for such contracts as long as they can demonstrate ability to meet NASA's needs within prescribed time limitations. The use of a time limitation instead of a geographic one, while not a cure-all, will nonetheless tend to broaden the geographic market for such services.

I should like to take time now to commend the Department of Defense for its imaginative program closely following the President's suggestions. Project Themis endeavors to create new academic centers of excellence in science and technology. This program is in addition to the regular contract-grant arrangement with institutions of higher learning and is not a substitute for them. It is hoped that eventually some 100 new departmental centers will be created by this plan—centers of superior scientific and engineering competence at universities which were previously poorly supported financially. Funds for implementing this plan were included in the fiscal year 1967 budget request and approved by Congress.

The Defense program aims at two complementary objectives: first, wider geographical distribution of Defense research funds, favoring institutions and areas that do not now receive substantial support; and second, the development of new centers of excellence capable of improved assistance to the Department of Defense in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, while commending this notable project, I would recommend that more attention be directed to contracts with industry and the in-house research and development effort of the Defense Department as well. Most of all, today, I would recommend that the legislation we have before us, the formal authorization for defense funds, should explicitly and specifically endorse the principle of geographical distribution. I believe the sense of Congress, embodied in legislation, an assurance of continuance and advancement of the principle involved. Such projects as THEMIS will be encouraged and assisted by such a declaration of intent.

Accordingly my amendment would read:

It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, coming from the Midwest as I do, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, because I believe that the gentleman does have a point. If we will look at the geographical distribution of the college research contracts in this Nation, we will see most of them are going to institutions along the east coast. But I rise in opposition because of the great concern about the wording of the amendment. I hesitate very much to have such an amendment adopted on the floor of this House without very close consideration.

Certainly we cannot place the defense of this Nation on a WPA basis. The defense of this Nation cannot be placed on geography alone.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that I share his interest in this amendment, but I believe the amendment should be voted down and the language watched very closely, because the first wording of the amendment says it is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds.

I have just gone through the experience of having a research contract application in my district turned down by the Defense Department. This application was by one of the foremost institutions in its field. It was a very competitive contract. I thought my institution made a very good case.

But certainly I would not want—and I am sure the gentleman from Indiana would not want—the defense of this Nation to be placed on a geographical basis alone.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that a program is already being started at the instance of Congress in this field, and I refer to Project Themis. I would like to read to the committee, from the hearings, the testimony of Dr. Foster, in whom the committee has a great deal of confidence. This will accomplish the purpose of the gentleman from Indiana. The sum of \$27 million has been allotted to Project Themis. Now I quote from the testimony:

The recently implemented Project Themis—our University Center of Excellence Research Program—was designed to make a high level of coupling and relevance a natural attribute of the program. The goal of this program is to strengthen the scientific and engineering capabilities of selected academic institutions throughout the country, enabling a larger number to carry out high quality research on problems related to national defense.

We are making progress in this area. Because of the first part of the language and the danger of the language, I ask

that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be voted down.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. The gentleman will agree that Project Themis goes only to research and development being accomplished in universities and colleges of the Nation and has nothing whatsoever to do with that research and development which is taking place in industry. Is that not correct?

Mr. ICHORD. Certainly Project Themis deals only with research among the colleges and universities.

I sympathize with the gentleman's purpose. I would not want, and I am sure the gentleman would not want, the defense of this country to be placed on geographical basis alone whether it be university research or research and development by private business. Research and development is the very beginning of the great defense of this country. We must have the research contracts placed in those institutions and businesses who are equipped to do the job. I would not want a research and development grant awarded, if the organization was not qualified or able to do the job, just because of geography. Too much emphasis on geography could be seriously detrimental to our Nation's defense and that is why we must proceed very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS
OF ALABAMA

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama: On Page 3, line 2, change the semicolon to a comma and add the following: "giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American merchant marine."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to accept your amendment. It is the same amendment that was accepted last year.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee as well as to the whole committee how much I appreciate the interest which the committee has shown in the progress of the merchant marine generally.

The committee report itself indicates the extent to which the committee has gone to see that this Nation does have a strong merchant marine.

As the chairman has said, this amendment was offered last year and was accepted by the Committee. I believe it has had a good effect. I hope it will be accepted again this year.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 2, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no naval vessel may be constructed in any foreign shipyard with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, unless specifically authorized by law."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I understand the amendment has to do with a new prototype ship. If this is the fact, I see no reason why we cannot accept it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to prohibit, unless specifically authorized by Congress, the construction in a foreign shipyard of any naval vessel with funds authorized to be appropriated in this bill.

Since last year, we have, for the first time, been constructing naval vessels in foreign shipyards. Two contracts have been let to British yards; another large one is impending. These ships are being built in Great Britain—not because Congress so decided, not because the Navy decided—but because the Department of Defense used the promise of the ship contracts to complete an arms sale to Great Britain. Let me emphasize that point. We are building these ships in Great Britain—over what I understand is the opposition of the Navy—in order to make good on the promise of our arms sale negotiator that we would throw certain contracts into the deal for the purchase of the F-111 aircraft.

This, I submit, is the wrong way to decide a question of such significance to our national defense and our national security. Whether we build ships abroad or not ought not to be decided on the basis of whether it helps us make an arms sale or not; it ought to be decided on the basis of whether it helps or harms the national defense.

Whether naval vessels should be built abroad is a matter which ought not be decided except by the Congress. Congress alone has the solemn constitutional obligation not only "to provide for the common defense" but also, specifically, "to provide and maintain a Navy."

My contention, of course, is that the construction of naval vessels abroad will be extremely harmful to the national defense in the long run. We help the British shipyards only at the expense of harming the American yards. If it is to become the policy of this Nation to build abroad and to drive American yards out of business, the Congress had better start giving consideration to where it is going to obtain its naval vessels when the foreign countries either cannot or will not build them in a future emergency.

Let me discuss a specific case which

involves a specific authorization in the bill before us.

The funds for naval vessels authorized by this bill include \$60.7 million for the construction of seven ocean minesweepers—MSO's. The Navy proposes to obtain these seven ships in a multiyear procurement. Combining the seven with the 4 MSO's authorized for fiscal year 1966 and the five authorized for fiscal year 1967, it will shortly advertise for the construction of the first 16 of this new minesweeper. The British will be invited to bid upon this multiyear contract, running well over \$100 million.

Now, this vessel has never been built before. It is newly designed and the first 16 will be the first models, or prototypes. The new ship will contain highly sophisticated equipment, both for minesweeping and mine hunting. It will operate in support of amphibious forces. It is a combat vessel which can be highly crucial to the success of naval operations. The Congress ought to assure itself that it will be able to procure and maintain this vessel in the shortest possible time in the event of future emergencies.

Yet, the Defense Department, in order to make good its pledge during an arms sale negotiation with Great Britain, proposes to take the risk of making a foreign yard the sole immediate source of supply for this vessel. That will be the practical result of the award of the multiyear contract for all of the first 16 of these vessels to a foreign yard. The foreign yard will have innovated the construction of a complex, newly designed vessel; it will have the experience, and the know-how which result from pioneering the first attempt to construct a brandnew ship.

What happens then, if we need more of these vessels badly, at some point in the future? I need not remind this House that we are engaged in a conflict whose end can now not be foreseen.

Well, we can ask the British yard to build us more of them, that is for certain. But what if the British yard, or the British Government, does not choose to build them? What if the British Government has requisitioned the yard for its own purposes? What if the British yard cannot build the ship either for lack of manpower or material, or cannot deliver them because of the military situation?

This Congress of course, will have no control over the British. It cannot seize the yards. It cannot force the foreign yard to give priority to their construction. It cannot act upon an emergency basis to obtain the vessels, as we have done at home with similar ships in the past.

This Congress, with its constitutional responsibility to provide and maintain a Navy, will then be forced to turn to our domestic shipyards. We will then find, if there are any yards then left capable of building this particular wooden-hulled minesweeper, that the procurement of the first ship will be delayed for at least 2 years, because all of the experience and know-how resides, not in the United States, but in a foreign shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is folly to build naval vessels in foreign yards. I

believe it is utter folly to build prototype naval vessels in foreign yards. I daresay you will not find many Navy men who privately will not agree. I believe the construction of these particular prototypes in Great Britain was opposed by the Naval Ships System Command.

If we are to take this grave risk of committing ourselves to a foreign yard for the future construction of combat Navy vessels, then I say it should not be as the result of pledge made by some arms sale negotiator in the Department of Defense. It ought to be a deliberate, eyes-open risk taken by the Congress in the light of a full study of all the facts involved.

My amendment would require congressional authorization before any naval vessel authorized by this bill could be constructed in a foreign yard. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support for the pending 412 defense authorization for fiscal 1968. My expression is with some trepidation. My concern stems from several areas which I would like to review.

To begin with, we are authorizing one of the largest armament programs in history as part of a \$76 billion defense budget next year. It has been estimated by ranking Members in the other body that even this budget must be augmented next year in excess of \$5 billion. We have come a long way over the past year proving that the U.S. military machine is not a paper tiger. We have certainly proved, however, that it is an expensive tiger.

In a manner our total effort in Southeast Asia is schizophrenic. Our tactical operations appear to be programed almost for the indefinite future. Our high budget strategic operations on the other hand appear to anticipate the war's termination every year. Expressly the budget this year was conditioned on the war's ending next month. The large defense supplemental appropriation of \$12.5 billion this year led many to believe that there was a credibility gap. I do not think there was a gap so much in our information as there was in our planning. The right hand many times does not know what the left hand is doing. It was this gap in our planning that allowed the United States to be cascaded over the past year into one of the most colossal of foreign encounters in our history. We started off calendar 1966 by approving a \$4.8 billion authorization bill for South Vietnam that is ending up at nearly the \$3 billion a month rate at the present time by a simple budget differentiation subtraction. The proof of the arithmetic is in the fact the Department of Defense has withheld approval of Department budget requests that would increase the 1968 defense budget by one-third.

The American people in a measure are being torn apart at the seams. Sixty-three percent support the President's

foreign policy on the last poll—many because of convictions—many because it is the patriotic thing to do or because of the obvious benefits of a unified foreign policy right or wrong. I hope that same 63 percent will voice support to the administration next year.

Our overall policy is fraught with a number of problems. In our effort to buy off the war overseas quickly we are almost breaking the bank at home and it is arguable that our military efforts today have done little but stimulate an equal but opposite enemy force.

On the economic side we have programed this year a \$9.7 billion deficit. The Pentagon in making its plans seems to care little that the deficit envisions raising the national debt not only the \$2 billion last July and the \$6 billion last February, but also \$8 billion next month. Nor is it readily apparent how the bills get paid if we fail to raise taxes at least \$4 billion next year and fail to allow for the sale of \$5 billion more of our paper assets in the form of participation certificates. Nor is it now apparent how a further unplanned supplemental defense deficit would be funded. Washington economics was fraught with disaster last February when we absolutely had to have the votes on the floor of the Congress to pay our bills the following week.

Unfortunately I see little real blue sky on the horizon during 1968. The problem simply is not credibility gap but the fact that the Bureau of the Budget simply is not geared to provide oversight of the Department of Defense. What is needed is some agency actually able to exercise heavy restraint on Defense spending such that the size and nature of our foreign military operations could be controlled.

I mentioned that while our war financing was almost panic on an annual basis of the war's duration, tactical operations are to the contrary. If this was true a year ago I think that it is true in spades today. Actually at one time last year I saw a type of victory on the horizon—not so today, largely because of escalation.

I firmly believe we have escalated to no place. In the face of continuous recommendations from General Westmoreland that the war will go on indefinitely, I have failed to understand the theory of escalation. When we in the States have assumed that our force level at 150,000 or 250,000 was at the outer limit considering that a \$750 billion economy was fighting a \$1 billion economy without modern transportation, a Navy or airpower, we have always assumed that the large buildup had some kind of foreseeable victory in mind.

General Westmoreland has recently addressed the Congress and the country is now brought to realize that even with 450,000 men and an expenditure rate of \$3 billion per month, that this is not enough.

I think that it is easy to move blindly ahead, every soldier or Congressman relying on the man ahead and ultimately on the Commander in Chief. When things go wrong or not as anticipated we blame the Russians, the Chinese, the Congress, the President, or the vocal minority. I

think that it is time to lose a little of the Notre Dame football team spirit and take dead aim on where we have been and where we are going.

Our bombing is marginally effective. We are panicking to get a better night fighter and anti-SAM device. Our effort overall reminds me of a giant trying to swat a gnat on a sheet of balsam wood with a sledge hammer, becoming very nervous in the endeavor. The largest importer into North Vietnam last year was not the Soviet Union but the United States when we dropped better than 1 million tons of bombs. It is possible that as a Great Society we are trying to solve a war problem with technology of infrared and kindred devices giving at all times too little consideration to the people problem and human nature. If we intended to break the back of the north with our bombing we have been unsuccessful. The morale of the North Vietnamese is better today after having knocked 534 of our multimillion dollar machines from the sky than it was a year ago. I am sure that they are longing to get a shot at our 14 million TFX-F-111's—that are now rolling off the runway. Neither would I classify our B-52 program as a howling success. I know when I hunt duck that unless I pick a bird out of the flock my game bag will be empty. Likewise to bomb a jungle on course and distance is noisy but little else.

While we stated a year ago that we needed to beef up our troops because there were 10,000 North Vietnamese troops in the south and that we needed at least a 10-to-1 overkill ratio to handle guerrillas in the bush—today while the United States has raised its level by 150,000 the North Vietnamese raised its level to better than 100,000. While we were fighting 225,000 solid core enemy a year ago, we now admit their numbers to be 278,000 and we frankly admit also that there is no magic in these numbers.

The casualty levels also have been a modified success story. We have talked too often about 10-to-1 kill ratio in our favor.

In the 1964 elections we had lost 450 Americans. Today we have lost 9,445 American boys and 56,327 have collected Purple Hearts and will collect pensions. In addition, last year the South Vietnamese lost 13,154 and 29,597 were wounded. Other allied losses are 845 dead and 2,330 wounded—all as of last week. Total casualties on our side of 102,062 last year alone then must be measured against 84,430 Vietcong dead and 126,645 estimated wounded. Since Vietcong casualty figures must be discounted by unidentified civilian casualties counted in the overall numbers it is readily apparent that an enemy casualty ratio of 1 to 2 would be optimistic.

And how are we doing on the ground? When last year the I Corps and the Mekong were well in hand—this year they are both open-ended areas. Army troops which should have been programmed to pacify the Mekong bread basket are now all tied up on the demilitarized zone.

In addition, we should take stock of attitudes outside of Vietnam. The Soviet

Union to date with a gross national product half the size of the United States has engaged in the war only modestly. The 120 Soviet ships that called on Haiphong last year is but a few percent of the U.S. sailings to Saigon. The Soviet Union has expended in North Vietnam to date in 15 years about the dollar amount that the United States expends in the south in 15 days. The Soviet Union is now considering a more ambitious program and it is no wonder since the United States indiscriminately calls every enemy peasant casualty a "bloody Communist."

The Soviets of recent date are holding support rallies for North Vietnamese. But for the accident of the Sino-Soviet cleavage the United States might have had the "fat in the fire" already. With Soviet opinion hardening I see nothing but a foreboding future for United States-Asian policy.

And how about opinion at home. Admittedly draft conscientious deferments are running 4 to 1 of previous encounters. Dr. King and Black Muslim Clay cannot now be considered as isolated objectors. The college community with serious reservations in the past will have calamitous reservations in the coming year. The Republican policy position recently disclosed statement in a measure indicates the possibilities for some men's logic. As more butter and bread are cut out of domestic programs in the coming year, more Americans will be introspectively quizzical of our policy.

What does this dissent mean? It means that the opinion is entitled to respect. In local school bond elections the rule of thumb is that bonds cannot be issued to levy a tax on all unless two-thirds of the voters assent. We can't remove a man from Congress once seated under the Constitution unless two-thirds of the Members so vote. Yet we subject every young person not deferred to the draft while 63 percent of the people of the country only have subscribed in a poll to our foreign policy.

Legally the United States can pursue its present foreign policy course. Not to be concerned with the respectable minority, however, is foolhardy.

I would say then that the better part of valor at the present time would be for the administration to be deadly serious with itself as to where we have been and where we are going. It will profit us little as a nation if we exhaust ourselves economically on North Vietnam only to find that our curtailment and lack of attention to the rest of the world, including the Americas, has allowed a Communist foundation to be dug on our hemispheric mainland. While our policy in Vietnam at one time was a matter of choice, at the present time it is monumentally compulsive. We criticized last year the U.S. AID program in South Vietnam as a conglomeration of confusion. If the situation is any better today I am unaware in spite of a major AID effort at reorganization. The South Vietnamese revolutionary cadre system of 30,000 men has suffered high casualties over the last year and is now reputed to be ineffective. What this all really means is that the war on poverty for the world's deprived and underprivileged must be fought of-

fensively through effective AID programs in a time of peace rather than defensively at a time of war. Because people are bound to wonder if the United States does not care for my political future at a time of peace, why do they care at a time of war with communism? I sincerely hope that one day we will realize that American wealth was given to us for a purpose. If we would help our neighbors but 25 percent of the magnitude of our military assistance, there might truly be a hope for peace in our time. The fact that AID and poverty programs are ineffective for reasons other than money is another story.

I would finally like to address a point in the pending bill called the FDL—fast deployment logistics program.

Over the past year and before I have concerned myself about the need for and manner of construction of the projected \$2 billion fast deployment logistics shipbuilding program. I am concerned likewise with this Nation's critical need for a nuclear Navy and the needs of this Nation for a crash program to revitalize our rapidly depleting merchant marine fleet.

It is obvious that as a result of our Southeast Asia involvement our Nation has become critically aware of our Nation's current deficit in ability to commandeer on short notice a surface fleet capability to deliver logistic material support on underdeveloped shores. Having participated as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a south Asia inspection tour last year, however, I am satisfied that this deficit was overcome by our Department of the Army and Navy at Chu Lai and Cam Ranh Bay by alternative means. I am personally also satisfied that though we moved troops to the shore before supplies, the overall delay has not seriously affected our total overall effort.

The FDL program could overcome the referenced deficiency. You could speculate that perhaps the program could also assist in providing the United States with a continuing capability with the C5A aircraft that would allow us to retract troops from overseas positions and still allow us to involve ourselves very quickly in a police action of war overseas. I am satisfied that the United States needs more of a capability to get out of encounters easily rather than get in. The nuclear Navy which I support has a "defensive" world image. A patrolling FDL fleet, I am sure, would be considered as "offensive."

Secretary McNamara said last year in Montreal that during the past 8 years there were 150 encounters around the world, one-third of which were affected by communism—some intracountry and some between nations in all of which the United States could have involved itself.

The idea of maintaining a \$2 billion fleet—an amount equal to the shipyard cost of our Polaris fleet, I think is preposterous.

I personally believe that the purpose of the FDL program and its manner of procurement have been confounded.

My reasons for opposing this program can be summarized as follows:

First. The timing is wrong. Our cur-

rent year deficit of \$9.7 billion should be limited in every way possible.

Second. The FDL program would be mutually exclusive to a nuclear Navy program which program I know carries paramount priority by the Navy Department. In the 1960's we have averaged \$1½ billion annual Navy expenditure for new construction. The FDL program while perhaps only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding program would comprise nearly 25 percent of all Navy construction procurement for the next 6 years.

Third. The FDL program I believe to be the most cost ineffective to ever receive the stamp of approval of the Secretary of Defense. The ships constructed will not be operational because they will have no place to go. To tie up \$2 billion of a merchant fleet we do not have dockside, loaded with progressively obsolete military equipment is not sound.

First, the Army and Marines would have to buy two of everything, one-half of which would be hermetically sealed for perhaps a 5-year period when it must be replaced without ever going in service—hopefully. If the ships were used once capriciously or ill timed, thereafter our fleet would be persona non grata all over the world.

The ships also would be manned 24 hours a day with military crews or civilians claiming overtime, hazard, and special-duty pay.

Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function; that is, a true, modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense. It is my information that such a fleet could be constructed for private merchant marine operation in private shipyards and could be available on call to the Department of Defense. The Department would pay an annual rental for the preemptive rights which financial guarantee I am informed would be adequate for private financing and construction.

The proposed pending FDL submission could be used to develop the required merchant fleet with the full FDL capability. This type of program has real merit. The work would be spread to all private shipyards or to one on a competitive bid. The United States would not get into the merchant shipping business. The ships would be in full operation and operated under the regulations of the Military Sea Transportation Service or Navy Department maintaining perhaps a partial FDL capability at all times. Taxpayers' money would be involved at a minimum. The base could be laid for a new modern merchant fleet and the fleet operation would not be construed as a hostile act.

Fourth. It would seem that if we must pre-position logistics hardware, that we could do it much cheaper at the many American bases overseas. If the FDL have a quick off-loading capability, they must also have a quick on-loading capability of containerized material. There should be no need, therefore, to maintain idle a complete fleet of floating warehouses.

We are authorizing in the present bill but two of the five FDL's requested by

the Department of Defense. Our committee has taken volumes of testimony in several days of hearing on this issue from military and private witnesses.

Though the committee is approving a total of four FDL ships, including two ships from the 1966 authorization, I would call attention to the following language in our report:

The committee, therefore, in approving two of the five FDL's requested in this year's budget does not commit itself to approval of the 30 ship program . . . before considering any further expansion of the FDL program beyond that recommended in the proposed legislation. The committee will want to see an approved program submitted by DOD with respect to

(a) Modernization of naval shipyards
(b) A strengthened American Merchant Marine

(c) A continued assurance that none of the ships previously authorized will be used in competition with the American Merchant Marine.

It is also possible that other shipbuilding companies who have not submitted proposals on the FDL program may find themselves qualified to bid on the design of one of their aerospace companies. If the proposal permits such a possibility the DOD would be remiss in not taking advantage . . .

Finally I would like to offer my views looking toward resolution of the Vietnam issue.

How should the United States resolve our current international dilemma? First, we should recognize that we are escalating to nowhere. We should resist escalation at all costs unless we know the escalated result. We have played too much blind man's bluff on a major scale too long. We should unilaterally scale down our cost and size of operations in South Vietnam and keep the burden of the conflict on the Vietnamese themselves. We should recognize, I believe, that the alternative to being pushed into the Tonkin Gulf in 1965 is not wholesale, all-out war in 1967 especially when our commander in the battlefield has no predictions for victory whatsoever in the foreseeable future.

If actions were scaled down and if our war budget could reapproximate the \$5 billion level, then we would be postured as a nation to wait out the hardheadedness of Ho Chi Minh. He sees us now restless in our Great Society and today his patience is better than ours.

In some encounters in the past perhaps we had not the option to reason why, only to do and suffer the consequences. Today we are involved in a new kind of undeclared war which is concerned not so much with a mad dictator's lust for power, but with a surge of people to better their plight. While we can destroy a dictator, you cannot destroy a whole people.

It is inevitable, therefore that the present conflict be concluded with some kind of an accommodation by the people on both sides of the encounter looking toward their mutual development. The United States has been, perhaps, too ready with the olive branch in the past and now grows weary of offering to negotiate. In time, I believe tensions will relax to the point when Ho Chi Minh will talk. It is to American interests that the bal-

ance of the world, free and Communist, not become too exercised or alarmed in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration, the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 463, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 401, nays 3, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—401

Abbott	Burke, Mass.	Dorn
Abernethy	Burleson	Dow
Adair	Burton, Calif.	Dowdy
Adams	Burton, Utah	Downing
Addabbo	Bush	Dulski
Albert	Button	Duncan
Anderson,	Byrne, Pa.	Dwyer
Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Eckhardt
Andrews, Ala.	Cabell	Edmondson
Andrews,	Cahill	Edwards, Ala.
N. Dak.	Carey	Edwards, La.
Annuzio	Carter	Ellberg
Arends	Casey	Erlenborn
Ashley	Cederberg	Esch
Ashmore	Celler	Eshleman
Aspinall	Chamberlain	Evans, Colo.
Ayres	Clancy	Everett
Baring	Clark	Fallon
Bates	Clausen,	Farbstein
Battin	Don H.	Fascell
Belcher	Clawson, Del.	Feighan
Bennett	Cleveland	Findley
Berry	Colahan	Fino
Betts	Colmer	Fisher
Bevill	Conable	Flood
Blester	Conte	Flynt
Bingham	Corbett	Foley
Blackburn	Corman	Ford, Gerald R.
Blanton	Cowger	Ford,
Blatnik	Cramer	William D.
Boggs	Cunningham	Fountain
Boland	Curtis	Frelinghuysen
Bolling	Daddario	Friedel
Bolton	Daniels	Fulton, Pa.
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	Fulton, Tenn.
Brasco	Davis, Wis.	Fuqua
Bray	Dawson	Galifianakis
Brinkley	de la Garza	Gallagher
Brock	Delaney	Gardner
Brooks	Dellenback	Garmatz
Broomfield	Denney	Gathings
Brotzman	Dent	Gettys
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Gibbons
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Gilbert
Broyhill, N.C.	Dickinson	Gonzalez
Broyhill, Va.	Dingell	Goodell
Buchanan	Dole	Gooding
Burke, Fla.	Donohue	Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hollfield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClary
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden

Mahon
Maillard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorehead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal

Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stagers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Derlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—3

Brown, Calif. Edwards, Calif. Fraser

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Barrett
Bell
Bow
Collier
Conyers
Culver
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Gialmo

Gubser
Hansen, Wash.
Howard
Landrum
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
Macdonald,
Mass.
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.

St. Onge
Saylor
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Watts
Willis
Wolff
Younger
Zion

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Utt.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McEwen.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Collier.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 463, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 666) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RIVERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 666, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 9240, as passed, as follows:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, \$768,700,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$2,527,100,000; for the Air Force, \$5,770,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, \$769,200,000; for the Navy, \$625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, \$23,100,000; for the Air Force, \$1,343,000,000.

Naval Vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, \$1,872,900,000, of which amount \$249,600,000 is authorized only for the construction of two nuclear powered guided missile frigates. The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no naval vessel may be constructed in any foreign shipyard with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, unless specifically authorized by law.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: For the Army, \$424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, \$5,100,000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, \$1,539,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$1,910,118,000, of which sum \$46,000,000 shall be used only for anti-submarine warfare programs; giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American Merchant Marine;

For the Air Force, \$3,313,514,000, of which amount \$51,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

For the Defense agencies, \$464,000,000.

SEC. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1968 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, \$125,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 401 of Public Law 89-367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support (1) Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam; (2) local forces in Laos and Thailand; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1968, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine."

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. Section 3034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of four years, from the general officers of the Army. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 402. Section 5081(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Chief of Naval Operations, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, for a term of four years, from officers on the active list in the line of the Navy, eligible to command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 403. Section 8034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed for a period of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the general officers of the Air Force. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 404. Section 5201(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Commandant of the Marine Corps, appointed by the President, for a term of four years, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, from officers on the active

list of the Marine Corps, not below the rank of colonel. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 405. The foregoing provisions of this amendment shall take effect as of January 1, 1969.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9240) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on May 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, a national railroad strike would be an intolerable setback to the economy of the Nation.

The President last week submitted a resolution to Congress which I believe constitutes the best, and perhaps only, recourse we can take to prevent a nationwide rail strike while at the same time protecting the public interest and preserving free collective bargaining.

We are now in our second extension of the Railway Labor Act and agreement between labor and management still appears distant. The irony of the situation is that, while the issues in this dispute are important, the differences that divide both parties are not that great.

I was hopeful that the recommendation of the Fahy Mediation Board would be acceptable. They were not.

But we cannot let this setback become an emotional stoppage to continuing the collective bargaining process. The stakes

are too great. The joint resolution now before us would not let that happen. Rather, it establishes specific procedures for assisting the disputing parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of remaining issues of difference.

The railroad system in this country is the largest carrier of intercity freight in the entire transportation system. In 1965 it moved approximately 700 billion ton-miles of freight, 43 percent of the total intercity movement. In 1965 railroads moved 4.3 billion ton-miles of Department of Defense freight traffic in the continental United States, 39.3 percent of the total.

In terms of passenger service, railroads have been declining steadily over the post-World War II period but still accounted for 17.5 billion intercity passenger miles in 1965, about 2 percent of total intercity movement and 18 percent of common carrier intercity travel. In certain cities, particularly New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, railroads perform significant commuter service. In 1965 they carried 192.6 million commuters, or about 750,000 for each working day.

These figures help to point out the importance of keeping our railroads in service. But of equal importance is preserving America's tradition of free collective bargaining—a subject of which we can't attach figures—but which can be counted among the most important individual rights of our citizenry.

The President's proposals take both situations into account. Indeed, the very heart of this resolution is to allow every opportunity for labor-management agreement without detrimental governmental intervention.

The proposed five-man board would be established for 90 days with the express hope that a privately negotiated settlement could be reached during that time. More importantly, no action of this board will, at any time, preclude continued bargaining or private agreement.

The first 30 days of the Board's existence will be dedicated solely to continued efforts of collective bargaining. If agreement cannot be reached, the Board will deliberate upon the recommendations of the Fahy panel—a group of men, I might add, whose efforts toward settling this dispute will historically distinguish them among labor mediators.

The Board's determinations on the Fahy recommendations will, after 60 days, be submitted to the President and the Congress.

I consider this process the most equitable means of establishing terms for agreement that could be devised. It encompasses all of the goals we seek—to avert the strike while at all times preserving collective bargaining. If agreement terms are established at the end of 90 days, they will only be in effect until private agreements can be reached.

I urge both labor and management to continue their deliberations in earnest. And I applaud the President's proposal as the most deliberate means of allowing them to do so.

COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN THE COUNTIES OF WATAUGA, MITCHELL, AVERY, AND YANCEY, N.C.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article and an application by WAMY, Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that WAMY Community Action, Inc., Boone, N.C., has filed a request for \$179,000 with the Office of Economic Opportunity for a community action news demonstration project in the counties of Watauga, Mitchell, Avery, and Yancey.

I had not seen a copy of the application until today. It came to me by courtesy of Tri-County News, a newspaper published in Spruce Pine, N.C. This newspaper printed the full text of the application and also had a front page news story dealing with the project.

Mr. Speaker, it is little wonder that the North Carolina Press Association has vigorously protested this attempt by a community action organization to establish a general newspaper with taxpayers' money. I cannot conceive of the Office of Economic Opportunity approving such action. I cannot understand the community action organization ever concurring up such a proposal. It is my hope that upon mature reflection, the directors of WAMY, Inc., will immediately withdraw their request for Federal funds for this project and that they will immediately forget the whole matter.

I am astounded at some of the language used by WAMY, Inc., in undertaking to support their request for this vast amount of Federal money. The gratuitous assault which this application makes upon ministers of the gospel and upon their followers in the counties of Watauga, Mitchell, Avery, and Yancey is shocking. Their further contention that the people of this area have a "long history of foraging" is contrary to my observation of the people of three of these counties whom I have been privileged to represent in the Congress at one time or another. From my visits to Watauga County over a period of years, I am sure that the allegations are equally incorrect as to that county.

The statement contained in the application that the communities are "fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief" is an insult to every citizen of the four-county area in which WAMY, Inc., operates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I know the mountain people of the area involved in this application. I have worked and lived with them for years. I have been honored to serve them in the Congress. I can say, without hesitancy, that I know of no finer, more law abiding and patriotic citizens than the people who have been reflected upon by the language of this application by WAMY, Inc. It may be that

some of them are not as financially affluent as they would like to be, but the same can be said of every area of the world. They are well-informed people who are imbued with ambition to improve their own status and are experiencing great progress in the development of a better economy for their area.

It may well be that the news media of the area fail to carry the message which will result in "pressure on the bodies responsible for financing" some of the programs that the originators of the application desire. This, however, does not warrant the Federal Government financing a propaganda organ for those who want to change the American system.

Mr. Speaker, this application by WAMY, Inc., should be rejected by the Office of Economic Opportunity if it is not promptly withdrawn by the organization.

I place the news article and the application by WAMY, Inc., in the RECORD for today:

WAMY SEEKS FEDERAL FUNDS FOR AREA NEWSPAPER

A government-supported weekly newspaper, operated in conjunction with a broadcasting project, has been proposed in Western North Carolina as one of the newest approaches in the poverty war, it was learned here today.

Putting Uncle Sam in the newspaper and radio business is the brainchild of the Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey County Community Action Agency, Inc. (W.A.M.Y.) at the urging of the Offices of Economic Opportunity. W.A.M.Y. has its headquarters in Boone, N.C.

Under its Demonstration Project Plan, a 16-page summary submitted to federal agencies for approval, W.A.M.Y. asks for \$179,000 to finance the two ventures.

"This project," says the W.A.M.Y. report "is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of \$3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1100 square miles of mountainous, wooded countryside on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey.

"The central characteristic of the low income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other . . . The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation . . ."

Citing other problems among the people of the area, the report says they are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes; they find it difficult to cope with other people and are distrustful of strangers; and they are lacking in their capacity for group feeling and group endeavor.

"Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that," W.A.M.Y. states, "is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. . . ."

The Community Action agency says it has "spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible."

W.A.M.Y. complains that the agency services now available to the people are underused. This situation exists, the report states, despite "a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts:

"(1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation.

"(2) Exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor.

"(3) Organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them."

It is as a cure to this indifference to federal programs that W.A.M.Y. proposes to organize its own weekly newspaper and broadcasting project.

A considerable portion of the newspaper content and broadcast material will be testimonials from those who have benefited from the poverty programs.

According to the W.A.M.Y. report, this will create among the poor a greater awareness that their problems are shared by others, give them a feeling of familiarity with other people and places, and strengthen their feeling of self-significance and importance.

In addition, the report states, the project will establish the belief among the poor "that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful."

There would also be a listing of opportunities available through the Community Action agency "and testimonials of low income persons who have benefited from them."

The proposed weekly newspaper would be produced by a staff of 23 full and part-time employees, headed by an editor at a salary of \$10,000 a year. It would be mailed free to approximately 8,000 residents of the four-county area.

Modern newspaper type-setting equipment, designed for the cold-type method of production, would be purchased and the newspaper would be prepared up to the printing stage in a 3,000-square-foot leased plant. The actual printing would be done on a contract basis, at an estimated \$250 a week, on the press of a weekly plant in Avery County.

Spruce Pine—The W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors April 25 approved a request for funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to finance an experimental communications project for low-income residents of the four W.A.M.Y. counties.

The project would provide a weekly newspaper for about 8,000 families in the four counties and also feature up to an hour a day in radio programming over local stations. It is designed to test whether it is cheaper to use mass communications or staff workers to inform low-income residents of opportunities and services available, and of the responsibilities of citizens.

The W.A.M.Y. Board approved the request after a long debate over the cost of the project and its effect on the local image of W.A.M.Y.

The Board also agreed to ask the North Carolina Fund for additional money over the next few months to make improvements in the W.A.M.Y. programs. Included in these requests will be money to help finance a community center at the old Toe River School in Avery County, and a large expansion of the Incentive Grants Program which helps finance community projects.

W.A.M.Y. staff members told the Board the communications project was an experiment, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity had asked W.A.M.Y. to submit the project.

"If we had our choice, we would spend the money on job training," W.A.M.Y. Director Ernest Eppley told the Board. "But we have no choice in the matter. If we don't want the communications project, some other area will get it."

Several agency heads on the Board, including Dr. Mary Michael of the Watauga County

Health Department and Dorothy Thomas of the Tri-County Regional Library, said the work of their agencies was hampered by poor communications with many people in the four counties.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PLAN AND SUPPORTING DATA FOR A COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN WATAUGA, AVERY, MITCHELL, AND YANCEY COUNTIES, N.C.

A. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

This project is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of \$3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1,100 square miles of mountainous, wooded countryside on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements, in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey in western North Carolina. Almost without exception these people are the direct descendants of pioneers of the early 1800's with a long history of subsistence farming and foraging, untouched by prosperity down to the present day.

(See "Background Paper on Operation of W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.," in Part II, Supporting Data, for more details on the history and characteristics of the low-income population.)

The central characteristic of the low-income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other. From the earliest days of settlement, the families and small clusters of families whose descendants make up the local poor have remained established in isolated homes or tiny settlements. Lack of good roads and lack of money to buy vehicles and telephones have maintained the physical factor in isolation.

The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation. They are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes. They find it extremely difficult to cope with other people and are generally reserved and distrustful of strangers. Their capacities for group feeling and group endeavor have not been developed. Their history shows few examples of cooperative endeavor. Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that, is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. Their "Communities" are in many cases not communities at all, but merely clusters of interrelated families, fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief, maintained in physical proximity only by the formidable obstacles of establishing livelihoods elsewhere.

The physical and psychological situation of these people makes it difficult to achieve two major objectives of the war on poverty: (1) achievement of effective community organization, and (2) improvement of social services.

The applicant CAA has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

The CAA has also expended a great deal of effort attempting to increase the services received and available to the poor from the CAA and non-CAA agencies. It has attempted this through three general approaches: 1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation, 2) exhorting the agencies to expand

their useful services and extend them to the poor, and 3) organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them. Despite a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts, the agency services available are underused, and local agencies remain underfinanced through lack of pressure on the bodies responsible for financing them.

A list of specific problems to be addressed in this Project are implied in the specific hypotheses set out in the following section.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesized that a project such as the one herein proposed for financing shall demonstrate the effectiveness of such projects in achieving the objectives listed below, all of which are either intrinsically desirable or instrumental to the elimination of poverty.

1. Creating, among the poor, a greater awareness of the fact that their predicaments, problems, hopes and aspirations are shared by many other individuals and communities across the four-county area, and thus helping create the feeling of identity necessary to concerted effort for improvement. This awareness would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

2. Creating, among the poor, a greater feeling of familiarity with people and places in the area beyond their immediate settlement, and thus helping develop attitudes conducive to cooperation across wide areas. This feeling of familiarity would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimony of low-income people.

3. Strengthening, among low-income individuals and communities, the feelings of self-significance and importance that will arm them for the task of coping with the systems and institutions that they should utilize for their advancement. The poor will be assisted to this end through the experiences of being interviewed, broadcast, and quoted in print.

4. Establishing the belief, among the poor, that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful.

5. Improving the poor's awareness of, interest in, familiarity with and demand for the opportunities provided through the CAA and through other social agencies. These objectives will be achieved through announcements of services and opportunities, and through the printed and broadcast testimony of low-income persons who have benefited from these opportunities.

6. Causing the existing social agencies, including the CAA, to concern themselves with the quality of execution of their programs and to be attentive to the preferences of the poor in the administration of their programs. These results would seem to follow if the poor are allowed to speak their minds on the air and in print.

7. Increasing the understanding, on the part of the middle-class, of the nature and problems of the poor and the utility of services provided by social agencies, an understanding critical to developing the necessary local support for anti-poverty efforts. This will be achieved through the middle-class' exposure to the radio broadcasts and occasional reading of the weekly newspaper.

C. METHODS, PROGRAM TECHNIQUES, WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1. Introduction

The aims of this Project will be carried out through two vehicles: 1) a four-county-wide weekly newspaper and 2) a radio program development and broadcasting system. The two vehicles will be directed and coordinated

by a single Project Director, who will edit the newspaper and generally supervise the work of the Broadcast Development Staff. The Project Director will report to a Board of Directors composed of 8 low-income and 5 non-low-income persons who will set general and editorial policy for the newspaper and for radio broadcasts.

The weekly newspaper will be staffed, with the exception of the editor, with local low-income people, who will act as reporters and assistant editors. The paper will be directed at the low-income readership, and will be distributed by mail, free, to all families in the four counties whose incomes fall below the OEO poverty-level. The newspaper will be printed by a local commercial printer.

The radio system will have two (2) professional staffers (Broadcast Developers) in addition to the Project Director, and the remaining four (4) people on the staff will be drawn from the local low-income population. The radio system staff, to be equipped with mobile recording vans, will travel throughout the low-income community taping programs for broadcast over the commercial stations that serve the area. The staff will also accept announcements and programs of interest and service to low-income people from the local CAA and from other public agencies.

2. The weekly newspaper

The weekly newspaper will be the most conventional of the information techniques to be demonstrated, in that the techniques of writing and printing a paper of this type are well known, although little used by the commercial press. The first, and most essential feature of the newspaper will be saturation circulation among the poverty-level residents of the four county area. This will be achieved by mailing the paper to all poor residents at no charge. Extensive mailing lists are presently available from the Community Action Agency files, and the Community Action field workers will be mobilized to add to the list as rapidly as possible. The twenty community "stringers" will also contribute to the mailing list. In its initial months of operation the paper will also hand distribute copies to community centers, schools and country stores, and will solicit readers to subscribe for themselves and their friends through subscription blanks which will be printed as a regular feature of the paper. It is expected that the newspaper can build to mailed circulation among almost all of the approximately 8,000 poverty-level families of the area within three months after it starts publication.

Although the paper will be circulated free-of-charge to its subscribers, the addressed, mailing method of circulation will prevent the paper from taking on the characteristics of a throwaway sheet. The positive impact on the poor of receiving a publication each week addressed to them and directed toward them will be far greater than the negative impact of receiving a free publication.

The newspaper will be supervised by one professional journalist, who will also be director of the entire Community Action News project. The editor will continually provide in-service training and supervision for his newspaper staff of three full-time assistants and twenty community stringers, but the great majority of the writing and editing will be done by indigenous personnel. The editor will constantly strive to teach effective communication through the language of the poor.

The paper will constantly try to balance its dual functions of providing information about services and opportunities, and of printing the "news" of the smaller communities and the larger county and area community.

The Informational content will include facts on how to get services, "how-to" columns on home management, child care, home

repairs, discussions of legal problems, "citizen's advice column" (answers to any questions submitted by readers), man-on-the-street interviews on specific questions, a column where readers can directly request services from agencies, information on voter registration and the organization of all local political parties, information about the various CAA programs and other information features as the need arises.

The news content of the paper will include coverage of activities in various communities as reported by the community stringers, news of local government, the news of the CAA, discussions of legislation that affects the poor, school news, births, deaths and marriages, hospital notes, schedules of all events that affect the poor, and articles of general interest that are solicited and purchased from the poor.

Feature articles will focus on extensive coverage of activities in one community that have informational and educational value for other communities. Features will also spotlight new services or new uses of existing services, and occasional issues of the papers will devote extensive space to in-depth coverage of one problem that affects large numbers of the poverty-level residents of the area.

Miscellaneous features of the paper will include the active solicitation of letters to the editor, free want-ads for low-income readers, and suggestions on how the CAA or the newspaper could serve the area better.

Editorials will be signed by the writer in most cases, and will reflect only his opinions. Unsigned editorials which reflect general opinions and policies of the paper will have prior approval of the executive committee of the Corporation's Board of Directors unless the Board delegates this authority to the editor.

The presentation of the paper's content will be almost as important as the content itself. The paper will be an eight-page tabloid and will feature a large body type—10 and 12 point—and will emphasize the actions, pictures and names of its readers. Each of the staff members will use a Polaroid camera, and will be encouraged to take pictures whether they are printed or not, as many pictures will be needed for the bulletin boards which are described later in this proposal.

Layout will play a vital role in attracting readers. The paper must look both professional, and different. Many stories will be told mainly with pictures and headline-size sentences. Modern advertising techniques will be applied to the paper's layout to make it highly readable and attention-worthy, and some items—such as announcements of meetings and new programs or services—will be presented in the form of simulated advertisements. This type of layout philosophy is so totally foreign to area printers, that it is essential to the paper's success that all make-up be done by the paper's staff and delivered to the printer as completed dummies, ready for the production of offset printing plates. The operation of typesetting equipment and the production of completed dummies at the paper itself will also provide valuable training for low-income personnel in journalistic skills that are in critically short supply in rural areas.

This combination of public information and local news, attractive and readable presentation, and saturation circulation among the poor in the area, will reinforce the organizational efforts of the poor in a way that the conventional press has never attempted to do in this area. A noted communications expert from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, speaking at a statewide meeting of CAA directors, commented that one of the greatest effects of mass media is to reinforce the attitudes and activities of those persons and groups whose efforts are reported in the media. The content of the weekly newspaper will seek not

only to reinforce community activities by reporting their news, but also to further organization and improvement efforts by providing the informational tools needed for advancement.

Each community correspondent will, in addition to his other duties, be assigned two bulletin boards that will be erected by Neighborhood Youth Corps crews at centers of community activity. These bulletin boards will carry announcements of community activities and pictures of community residents involved in CAA programs or other community self-help projects. Mimeographed materials for the bulletin boards will be produced at the newspaper office on community action subjects of interest to several communities or pertaining to the entire four-county area. County coordinators of the CAA will use the bulletin boards and help the community correspondents in keeping up-to-date materials posted on the displays. The public information staff of the North Carolina Fund has agreed to assist in the production of printed materials for the bulletin boards and to assist in developing new methods of using the displays as communication vehicles.

As the poor begin to become involved in the newspaper, and begin to respond by writing letters, asking questions and voicing complaints, the paper will serve as an important information gathering vehicle for use of the CAA. A staff member of the Human Resources Planning project—funded under a demonstration grant—will serve on the paper's Board of Directors.

One of his delegated functions will be to coordinate the planning program with the paper, and to use the newspaper's information as an indicator of how well existing CAA programs are matching the needs of the poor.

At least one Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee will be assigned to the paper's staff to search its columns for possible referrals to the public agency personnel. The CAA's public information worker will also scan the paper for articles suitable for reprint in the county weeklies and in the daily press outside the area, so as to further reinforce the activities of the poor and to strengthen the communication links between the poor and the middle class. The CAA's OJT Coordinator will try to place members of the paper's staff in permanent jobs with the conventional media in the area, so as to open training opportunities on the paper to other low-income residents.

Preliminary training for newspaper personnel will be directed by the editor with the help of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina fund, which has offered its full cooperation in assisting with preliminary and in-service training. The most important training, however, will be conducted by the editor in his day-to-day supervision of the production of the paper, and in regularly scheduled in-service training sessions which he will supervise.

The editor is the logical person to supervise the entire project because of his wide contacts with the four-county area through his full and part-time newspaper staff of 23 persons. From his position he will be able to schedule and coordinate the radio units so that their work closely follows the patterns of events among the poverty-level residents of the area. Although the mobile units will attempt to cover every area of the four counties during each six weeks of their operation, it is essential to the success of the radio operation that the mobile units appear "where the action is."

3. Radio system

The radio portion of the project is more experimental in nature than the newspaper. Public information and participation projects over a long-term period using the radio medium as described in this proposal are

an extreme rarity in conventional broadcasting. The techniques are used somewhat in educational FM broadcasting, but these stations reach mainly the middle and upper class audiences which own FM receivers.

The radio project will be centered in two mobile recording vans with equipment capable of producing almost any kind of radio program. Each of the vans will operate in two of the four counties and will be loosely assigned to the commercial station which broadcasts in those counties. Most of the programming produced, however, will be appropriate for broadcast on either station and will be used on both stations.

There is a possibility that a third commercial radio station will become operational in the southernmost county of the four county tier during the period of the demonstration grant, but programming for this station will consist mainly of duplication of programs produced for the two stations now in existence. This third station will add significantly to the primary coverage area of the radio programming, bringing the coverage area from 85 to approximately 95 per cent of the four county target area.

Each of the mobile units will travel to a different community each day, recording for broadcast at the community center in sight of the people, interviewing participants in work projects or CAA programs, plugging community activities, soliciting man-in-the-street interviews and questions for the citizens' advice bureau, recording the discussion and debate at community meetings, and generally allowing people to express themselves through talk or musical performances.

From each recording session in a community will come the program material for a day's broadcasting. Questions asked by the community people will be answered on five minute radio spots. The questioner will be told at the interview when the answer to his question will be broadcast. Longer interviews, discussions, and musical performances will be broadcast on two fifteen minute segments or one thirty minute program daily on each station.

Because of the geographical characteristics of the area, it is expected that each recording team will spend at least one night a week in the northeast and southwest ends of the four counties in order to cut down on time wasted in travel, and to insure that the entire four-county area is covered thoroughly and equally.

At each recording stop, the Friendly Home Visitor (non-professional CAA health case-worker) for that area will accompany the van to take referrals. One of the jobs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee apprentice assigned to the van will be to take duplicate referrals to assure the delivery of services.

Other five-minute spots and occasional longer programs will be recorded by the broadcast developers from information gathered from public agency personnel, including the CAA. Homemakers from the Agricultural Extension Service and group workers from the CAA will provide information for shows on the preparation of commodity foods, other recipes, sewing hints and child care. CAA horticulturalists working with the Agricultural Extension Service, a delegate agency, will provide farm information. The Citizen Education Specialists of the CAA, who is a lawyer, will provide information for a legal advice program, and for programs dealing with county government and voter information. The public information worker of the CAA will provide information about CAA programs on both the county and four-county level. Most of the service information spots for one week can be recorded and edited for broadcast in an intensive half-day's work, thereby allowing the broadcast developers and their assistants to spend most of their recording time in the field.

Two of the essential elements in producing successful radio programs will be the development of attractive program formats and the compilation of extensive information files that can be used to answer questions asked in the field and to make effective referrals. Some trial and error work is anticipated in the development of suitable formats. The two radio stations involved have offered to assist in developing formats and in measuring their success. The CAA personnel and the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund will assist in providing information on service delivery and citizen education. It is expected that about three months will be required to build up to the desired programming production level of an hour a day for each station.

Programming will be presented on a combination of public service and commercial air time. Radio station WATA in Boone has offered the use of five minutes of public service time daily. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine has offered the use of fifteen minutes of public service air time daily. The owner of WTOE also indicated that attractive public service programs could be sold to commercial sponsors, thereby freeing budgeted money for the purchase of additional air time. Since the project will not be dependent on commercial sponsors for support, however, there is no possibility that commercial sponsors could influence program content. Commercial sponsorship could be an effective tool for involving part of the business community in the war on poverty, but the appropriateness of spending federal money for the development of programs which might be sponsored by commercial sponsors is a matter for decision by the funding agency. Other public service programs produced by public agencies are sponsored, and FCC regulations do not differentiate between public service time that is given free and that which is sold to sponsors.

The medium of radio by its very nature provides little opportunity for censorship, as previewing of recorded material is a costly and time-consuming job. All programs will be strictly non-partisan, as required by OEO regulations and federal statutes, and the radio station owners have agreed that only partisan programs or serious breaches of libel law and good taste will be considered grounds for cancellation of program contracts.

Preliminary training for broadcast personnel will be conducted by the public information staff of the North Carolina Fund with the assistance of instructors at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, using the facilities of both institutions. Most of the training of the non-professional assistants will be conducted by the broadcast developers on the job.

The recording vans will provide physical support for community organizations, as well as public recognition. Each of the vans will carry a portable public address system that can be used either from the van or from inside a building. Other physical support equipment will be used to compare the effectiveness of various communications methods. One of the vans will carry video tape equipment that will be used to record parts of community meetings for replay in other communities. The equipment will also be used for the production of short training tapes on subjects such as: how to run a meeting, how to plan a community budget, and other subjects of interest to community organizations.

The other van will carry movie projection equipment capable of projecting films through a screen suspended from the rear of the van in daylight, and that can be used in the normal manner in a darkened building. Several existing films on community organization and service delivery will be carried as part of the van's equipment, and its crew will use a 16mm movie camera for the

production of short films about local communities and for the production of news film for area television stations.

4. Financial administration

A public accountant in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to manage the financial affairs of the corporation on a contract basis. The accountant will set up the books of the corporation according to existing guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He will train and supervise the clerical staff of

the corporation in bookkeeping, make all financial reports, and close the books of the project preparatory to final audit.

5. Timetable

The Community Action News Project will begin operation within five weeks after confirmation of receipt of the Demonstration grant. The project will build up to full circulation and full broadcast time within three months after it begins operation. This timetable is illustrated in the table below.

Process—Time subsequent to confirmation of demonstration grant

[In weeks]

	1	2	3	4	5	6						17
Formation of board and incorporation of community action news	X											
Hiring and orientation of personnel	X	X	X	X	X							
Training of nonprofessional staff	X	X	X	X	X							
Process of building to full newspaper circulation and target radio broadcast level						X	X	X	X	X	X	X

D. ORGANIZATION

1. Governing body

An independent, private, non-profit corporation shall be formed to carry out the Community Action News Project.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall manage the establishment of the corporation. When the initial directors of the corporation have been selected and have assembled, elected officers, written Articles of Incorporation, written By-Laws, and received a corporate charter from the State of North Carolina, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. shall, with the concurrence of OEO, delegate the Project to this new Corporation.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action Inc., shall ensure that the composition of the governing body, and the by-laws of the corporation shall be consistent with the intent of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The governing body of the corporation shall be constituted as follows:

a. One representative of the local press to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors with the concurrence of the press.

b. A representative from one of the two local radio stations to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors, with the concurrence of the stations' owners.

c. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action staff to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors.

d. A representative from Appalachian State Teachers College to be chosen by the College.

e. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors to be chosen by that Board.

f. Eight representatives of the poor, two from each county, to be selected by the Community Development Councils in each county. Only persons with incomes below the poverty line shall be considered qualified representatives of the poor.

2. Operating organization

Subject to the corporate By-Laws and policies to be established by the Board of Directors, and subject to the Board's regular review, the authority for the operation of the project shall be delegated to the Project Director. The Project Director shall be responsible for carrying out the work program described under section "D" of this application. Individual staff positions and duties are described below.

a. Senior Personnel

(1) **Project Director**—The project director shall directly supervise the weekly newspaper and train low-income personnel in its production. He shall provide overall supervision and staff direction for the entire Community Action News project.

(2) **Broadcast Developers**—(2)—The broad-

cast developers shall develop suitable program formats, and shall assemble, write, edit, and record in the field, materials to fit the program format. They shall arrange recording and broadcast schedules under the supervision of the project director. They shall train their low-income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and in the techniques of radio production and broadcasting, and supervise their work in the field.

b. Junior Personnel—Broadcast

(1) **Technical Assistants**—(2)—These personnel shall directly assist the Broadcast Developers. They shall learn and use the skills necessary to operate recording and audio-visual equipment, and shall learn and use the techniques of radio production and announcing.

(2) **Apprentices**—(2)—The apprentices shall work as trainees with each Broadcast Developer and his assistant, and shall have the specific job of monitoring recording sessions and noting requests for services or information indicating the need for services, and referring this information to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

c. Junior Personnel—Newspaper

(1) **Assistant Editor**—The assistant editor shall learn and use the techniques of assembling and editing copy, planning layouts and writing headlines, and producing make-up dummies for offset printing.

(2) **Reporters**—(2)—The reporters shall learn and use the techniques of news writing and photography, including the various skills necessary for investigative and government reporting, human interest writing, and the production of comprehensive feature stories.

(3) **Clerical**—(2)—The clerical personnel shall learn and use the techniques and skills necessary for efficient secretarial work. One clerical person shall also be trained to operate Justewriter typesetting equipment and the other clerical person shall be trained in bookkeeping and proofreading.

(4) **Correspondents**—(20)—Twenty local low-income persons shall be trained to accurately judge and report the news of their local communities.

(5) **Apprentices**—One or more Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall be assigned to the newspaper to work as trainees with the full-time personnel. Apprentices shall have the specific job of scanning the news pages and noting requests for services or information which indicates the need for services, and referring this information on to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

E. RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROJECT

1. Expense items

a. Project Staff

The applicant has no particular individuals in mind for staffing the project at this time,

but is confident that qualified personnel can be recruited for the professional and non-professional positions on the Project staff at the salaries indicated in the enclosed Budget.

b. Project Equipment and Supplies

The applicant believes that the equipment and supplies listed in the Budget can be obtained at the costs indicated without undue delay.

c. Contract services:

(1) **Press**: The publisher of the Avery Journal in Newland, North Carolina, has agreed to print the weekly newspaper.

(2) Radio:

(a) Radio station WATA in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 5 minutes daily as public service time.

(b) Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 15 minutes daily as public service time.

(c) The above two stations' signals reach practically all points in the 4-county area served by the CAA which will coordinate with the Project, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., (see Exhibits B and C in the supporting materials for an illustration of geographic coverage of these radio stations.)

Although no data on listening habits are available, a 1965 survey by the North Carolina Fund revealed that out of a random sample of roughly 8% of the low-income families in the four-county area, 80% owned radios.*

Financial Administration and Training

A public accountant in Boone, N.C., Mr. Jack Williams, has agreed to handle the bookkeeping and accounting affairs of the corporation and train project personnel in any bookkeeping necessary on a contract basis if requested. The agreement with Mr. Williams is, of course, subject to the approval of the Corporation upon its establishment.

2. Non-expense items

a. Technical Assistance

(1) The University of North Carolina: The Chairman of the Department of Radio, Television, and Motion Pictures of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, has offered the use of his department's radio facilities for the training of broadcast staff.

(2) The North Carolina Fund: The director of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund, Billy E. Barnes, has offered the full use of his staff and facilities for training of newspaper and broadcast personnel, (including on-the-job training). The Fund also offers the use of citizen education programs, which it continues to develop for use with low-income persons.

b. Supportive and Coordinating Services: W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. offers the full cooperation of its staff in the following ways:

(1) **Field Staff**: W.A.M.Y. and its delegate agencies field over 12 full-time contact workers in each county. These workers will assist the project in completing referrals, arranging programs, providing "feedback" on the impact of the project, and in compiling mailing lists for the weekly newspaper.

(2) **Professional Staff**: The professional staff will assist the project in preparing service information programs and columns.

(3) **Planning Staff**: The planning staff will assist in any evaluation of the project, as well as provide information on resources available to individuals and communities from all sources.

(4) **Public Information Staff**: The public information staff will provide regular information on current W.A.M.Y. programs, as

* The County Community Development Councils are made up of representatives of most of the communities in each county.

* A Survey of Low-Income Families, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina, (Data not yet published).

well as presentations prepared by its Citizen Education Specialist.

(5) Neighborhood Youth Corps: The W.A.M.Y. Neighborhood Youth Corps project will help select and will pay enrollees who will work as apprentices in the Broadcasting Project, and will provide these with supporting services in the form of general education and counseling.

F. PHYSICAL FACILITIES REQUIRED

Approximately 3,000 square feet of indoor floor space will be required for the Project's housing. This space would provide office space for newspaper personnel and the Broadcast Developers, and for a composition room, make-up room, project room and sound editing room. Some expense (as indicated in the Budget) will have to be taken to convert floor space into specialized work areas, but the labor of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall reduce the cost of renovations. No difficulty is anticipated in finding the necessary space.

G. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Evaluation arrangements for this project will be left to the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The staff of W.A.M.Y. Community Action shall be made available to assist in evaluation upon request.

H. RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE APPLICANT

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. has been operating anti-poverty programs since June of 1965. It is currently operating nine (9) year-round CAP components, a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation (in-school and out-of-school), an On-the-Job Training Project. It has recently begun operation of Human Resources Planning Project under a Demonstration Grant from OEO. (A copy of a Community Action Program Status Report, enclosed under Part II, Supporting Data, provides some detail on W.A.M.Y.'s CAP operations).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL

1. Senior personnel

a. Project Director-Editor: The editor shall have an AB degree in journalism or equivalent work experience, and shall have at least two years experience as editor of a weekly newspaper. He shall also have had experience in and understanding of radio broadcasting techniques.

b. Broadcast Developers: The two broadcast developers shall have BS degrees or equivalent work experience in radio production and electronics, and shall have at least two years experience in radio production and announcing, and extensive experience in field recording.

2. Junior personnel

Junior personnel shall have the talents necessary for training in their various jobs. They shall be hired by the project director from local applicants with incomes below the poverty level.

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30, 1968—GRANT PERIOD

Funds requested from OEO

A. Personnel:

1 Project director-editor (\$834 per month).....	\$10,000
2 Broadcast developers (\$708 per month).....	17,000
1 Assistant Editor (\$375 per month).....	4,500
2 Reporters (\$375 per month).....	9,000
2 Technical assistants (\$375 per month).....	9,000
2 Clerical (\$333 per month).....	8,000
20 Correspondents (one-fourth time) (\$65 per month).....	15,600
8 percent benefits.....	4,600
Accounting (see attachment).....	3,000
Subtotal	80,700

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30, 1968—GRANT PERIOD—Continued

Funds requested from OEO—Continued

B. Training (not applicable).....	-----
C. Permanent equipment (see attachment).....	\$38,911
D. Consumable supplies (see attachment).....	10,644
E. Travel (see attachment).....	7,648
F. Miscellaneous expenses (see attachment).....	41,167
Total	179,070

Item A

Public accountant to serve as financial officer of Community Action News on contract basis. Accountant will open and close books, pay for audit, train project personnel in bookkeeping and handle all financial transactions of corporation.....	3,000
---	-------

Item C

26 Polaroid cameras (at \$125).....	3,250
1 Mimeograph (at \$350).....	350
1 Justwriter recorder (at \$2,430).....	2,430
1 Justwriter reproducer (at \$3,245).....	3,245
1 Justwriter headliner (at \$825).....	825
1 Ampex video tape recorder (at \$3,000).....	3,000
1 Bell & Howell 16-millimeter camera (at \$350).....	350
1 projection system (at \$1,000).....	1,000
2 RCA electronic lecterns (at \$125).....	250
2 mobile recording studios (see supplement) (at \$8,969).....	17,938
2 staff vehicles (at \$1,900).....	3,800
40 bulletin boards (at \$30).....	1,200
8 desks (at \$77).....	616
12 chairs (at \$22).....	264
3 filings cabinets (at \$45).....	135
1 adding machine (at \$208).....	208
2 tables (at \$25).....	50
Total	38,911

Item D

1,450 Polaroid film, at \$2.10.....	3,020
150 flashbulb packs, at \$1.50.....	300
2 electric typewriters (rental), at \$180.....	360
4 upright typewriters (rental), at \$90.....	364
2 portable typewriters (rental), at \$60.....	120
8 office supplies, at \$180.....	1,440
4 cases Justwriter tape, at \$25.....	100
50 hour video tapes, at \$60.....	3,000
40 rolls 16 millimeter film, at \$15.....	600
400 rolls recording tape, at \$1.85.....	740
Miscellaneous audio expendable supplies.....	600
Total	10,664

Item E

Two staff cars, 11,000 miles each at \$0.08.....	1,760
Two vans, 75 miles per day, at \$0.08.....	3,120
Out-of-area mileage, 3,600 miles, at \$0.08.....	288
Per diem, out-of-area training, 8 persons, at \$12 per day for 5 days.....	480
Per diem, 100 nights for 2 recording crews, at \$10 per crew per night.....	2,000
Total	7,648

Item F

Commercial air time, radio station WATA:	
1,500 5-minute spots, at \$3.....	4,500
600 15-minute spots, at \$8.....	4,800
Radio station WTOE:	
900 5-minute spots, at \$3.....	2,700
600 15-minute spots, at \$5.....	3,000
Printing, 8,000 copies per week, at \$250.....	13,000

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30, 1968—GRANT PERIOD—Continued

Funds requested from OEO—Continued

Item F—Continued

Postage, 8,000 copies per week, at \$0.0125 per copy.....	\$5,200
Article purchase, two articles per week, at \$5 per article.....	520
Insurance, four vehicles.....	332
Insurance, recording equipment.....	315
Physical plant, rental of 3,000 square feet, at \$0.05 per square foot.....	1,800
Renovation.....	500
Utilities, at \$75 per month.....	900
Telephone (previous experience).....	1,800
Soundproofing, two vans, at \$300.....	600
Equipment installation, two vans, at \$400.....	800
Equipment maintenance, two vans, at \$200.....	400
Total	41,167

Item C. Supplement

2 Ford parcel delivery chassis P-350 with insulated, walk-in body, 6 cylinder, 300 cubic inch, 170 horsepower engine, at \$3,800.....	7,600.00
2 Terado dual continental transistorized inverter, 600 watts, at \$302.38.....	604.76
4 Ampex 602-4, full-track, 7.5 ips unmounted recorded, at \$575.....	2,300.00
2 Crown SS801, full-track 7.5-15 ips, remote controlled master studio recorder, at \$1,200.....	2,400.00
2 Sparta 815 mixing console with accessory amplifiers, at \$650.....	1,300.00
2 Uher 4,000 report-L field tape recorder, at \$440.....	880.00
2 RCA 77-DX studio microphone, at \$251.50.....	503.00
2 Electro-Voice 666 field microphone, at \$150.....	300.00
2 Rek-O-Kut B-12H 3-speed turntable, at \$165.....	330.00
2 Rek-O-Kut S-320 tone arm for above, at \$34.95.....	69.90
2 G.E. VR-II cartridge for above with replacement styli, at \$24.95.....	49.90
Miscellaneous audio supplies and equipment.....	1,000.00
Furniture (chairs, table, lights, etc.).....	600.00
Total	17,937.56

PROPOSED NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION IN NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE FINANCED BY OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. I was surprised and shocked when I learned that it is being proposed that the Federal Government sponsor and finance a newspaper to be circulated in several counties in our State.

We have always maintained a separation of State and press in this country and in my judgment it would be unwise to abandon that policy. A Government-financed newspaper could be a danger-

ous tool for the dissemination of propaganda. A Government-controlled press would be intolerant in a free society and for an agency of Government to sponsor and finance a newspaper could be the first step in what might lead to control.

While I do not represent the area where this newspaper is supposed to circulate, and do not wish to inject myself into the community's affairs without invitation, I will add that I previously had the high honor of representing two of the counties and still feel very close to the people who reside there. But I am interested in this proposition because of a precedent that might be established if this project is implemented. I am, therefore, speaking out today for the purpose of concurring in the views expressed by my colleague and to express my own views as an interested citizen and a Member of Congress.

SPEECH BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE AT 90TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable Cyrus Vance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit for reprinting in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding speech made by the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the 90th annual convention of the diocese of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va., on May 6, 1967.

His statements deserve the plaudits of the entire country, and they bear careful reading:

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE AT THE 90TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF WEST VIRGINIA, TRINITY CHURCH, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., MAY 6, 1967

I deeply appreciate your invitation to address this 90th Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of West Virginia. It gives me a chance, as you may know, to come home again to the land of my forebears. And it gives me a welcome opportunity to meet with the leaders of my church in this state—clergymen and laymen alike.

The Episcopal Church has always been concerned with the problems confronting men in the world in which they live. So, in your discussions here, I am certain that you have sought to relate your faith to the world that is, as well as the world that ought to be. In so doing, no issue comes more rapidly to the forefront of concern than this nation's involvement in Vietnam.

Quite recently, 1000 divinity students of many faiths wrote a letter to Secretary McNamara. It was a thoughtful and responsible communication in which these young men expressed both a moral and a policy dissent. "Large numbers of divinity students," they said, "cannot support the war in Vietnam because they believe this war is neither in the religious tradition of just wars nor in the national interest." They noted, too, that there are other Americans who are similarly troubled.

I appreciate both the depth and the sin-

cerity of this concern. It deserves the most serious thought. Because the matters at stake are so profoundly important to us all, I will devote my time tonight to a consideration of the fundamental issues involved in Vietnam.

I intend to examine both allegations made by the divinity students—"that this war is neither in the religious tradition of just wars, nor in the national interest."

I do not agree with these conclusions. But, at the same time, I respect their convictions and I strongly defend their right to express them. Informed, disciplined, and responsible dissent is the very essence of our freedom.

In America today, one of the greatest barriers to understanding is the very nature of the dialogue which has developed over the issue of Vietnam. It is heated and intolerant. The lines, on both sides, are too sharply drawn.

We need, I think, to restore the national sense of balance, for there is little enlightenment in the dark words which pass back and forth over a gulf of misunderstanding today. We can agree to disagree. But, surely, we must all seek meaningful communication as a bridge to reasoned understanding and rational action.

Vietnam has been viewed too often in absolutes of black and white. The situation is not so starkly apparent as it is sometimes painted by the several sides in the debate. There are gray tones. The issues are complex and sometimes ambiguous. This is what makes it difficult to discuss or understand Vietnam. But we must recognize this belated aspect of the problem in trying to see through it clearly. Clear vision depends upon a dispassionate balancing of all the factors at play.

I have given much time to this balancing of the essential elements. Let me illustrate the complexities of such a process by brief mention of the troublesome grays on the Vietnam scene.

Certainly there is a shade of gray in the state of political affairs in South Vietnam. It is not ideal in terms of stability, freedom, or progress. But one must balance against this the progress made in recent years in the face of an armed struggle for survival. Local elections have been held, a Constituent Assembly has met, a new Constitution has been promulgated, local elections are in process, and national elections are to be held in September. Contrasted with the colonial regimes of yesterday, or the suffocating rule which North Vietnam would offer as an alternative, the hopeful progress of the Republic of Vietnam is clearly apparent.

Related to this is the fact that there are some South Vietnamese, recalling colonial days, who distrust the occidentals and would like to see him leave. This is not, however, the view of even a substantial minority. The people see other Asians joined with us—Koreans, Thais and Filipinos. They see young Americans helping to build a new Vietnam even while others are dying on the battlefield. They note that, with Americans, the energy and resources flow into the country, not out. And they know from history that we are not an imperialistic nation.

The Vietnamese Armed Forces are another case in point. They are not yet as effective as they should be, and will become. Conceding this, however, they have come a long way since 1954 when there was no national army. They have fought long and hard. Often, they have fought well. The measure of their determination is their sacrifice—in equivalent population terms, they have lost more men in action than the total of American battle deaths since 1776.

Another example is the question of civilian casualties. Regrettably, we have caused some in both North and South Vietnam. But this has not been our intent. Rather, in defending South Vietnam, we have sought in every possible way, even at some risk of our own

men, to avoid harming civilians. On the other hand, those who have inflicted this war on South Vietnam have set out to terrorize, maim and kill civilians as a deliberate tactic of conquest. The scales for judgment must be balanced accordingly.

And there is, without question, an element of native discontent in South Vietnam. This is rooted in the colonial past and the imperfect present, as well as in aspirations for the future. But, recognizing this, it is quite another thing to leap to the conclusion that this is just a civil war. It is not, and I shall discuss this more fully in a few moments.

When I have weighed all the facts—those which are disquieting as well as those which are reassuring—I find that the scale inclines sharply and without hesitation to the position which we have taken in Vietnam. Of course, there is room for concern, but not for real doubt that our course of action in Vietnam is right and necessary.

Turning back now to the statement of the divinity students, I find it difficult to understand what they believe to be a just war "in the religious tradition." Does this depend upon the particular religion of those who sit in judgment? Were the crusades a just war? Was the Saracen invasion of Europe a just war?

Is the use of military force ever moral?

The Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Minister of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, recently said this:

"Military force as such is neither morally right nor morally wrong. It is the uses to which it is put—the times, the places, the amount and the purposes—which determine the moral or immoral use of force. And in this stage of the development of mankind, failure to use military force in the proper time and place, and for the proper purpose, can be disastrous and highly immoral."

The world has been racked with wars in the names of religious causes throughout history, but there is a transcendent moral ethic—the right of mankind to determine its own destiny. Certainly this is at the heart of the Judeo-Christian ethic which teaches that man is created in the image of God, by which we mean that he is given free will to determine his own destiny.

Applying this standard to the conflict in Vietnam, is our cause just? I believe that the answer is an unequivocal yes, because our objective in Vietnam is to permit the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny. However, fundamental to the answering of this question is a threshold question. Are we, as some charge, intervening in a civil insurrection 10,000 miles from our shore? Or are we assisting a small nation, at its request, to resist aggression from beyond its borders—an aggression mounted by those who would dictate that nation's future by force of arms, and would take from its people the right to shape their own future? It is to this threshold question I now turn.

There is, as I have said, some genuine discontent and an element of disaffection in South Vietnam. This is hardly surprising in view of the tortuous and complex history of the Vietnamese people, and the fact that they are beset by all the unfulfilled aspirations of an underdeveloped land in an affluent world. The fact that there is some dissatisfaction which the communists have exploited, does not prove, however, that the Vietnamese conflict is a spontaneous, indigenous southern movement.

It is true, too, that there is a long history of Vietnamese nationalist resistance to foreign domination. This began at the close of the 19th Century, even as the French completed their colonial conquest, and continued unabated throughout the first five decades of the 20th Century. Vietnamese nationalism took definitive form, during World War II, in the Viet Minh organization sponsored by the Chinese Nationalists to harass the Japanese in Indo-China. But this movement,

while not communist-organized, was joined soon after its inception by the Vietnamese Communist Party which took control of the Viet Minh and subverted it to Communist Party ends. In so doing, they exploited the genuine nationalist sentiments to which the Viet Minh appealed and which gave the Viet Minh much of its strength.

The real political power base of the Vietnamese Communist Party was created in 1945 after Japan's precipitate surrender when the communists used the Viet Minh to seize power in Hanoi and proclaimed the existence of the (so-called) "Democratic Republic of Vietnam" under Ho Chi Minh.

In the days which followed, Ho prepared for and then fought the war with the French. A first tactic was to announce the "dissolution" of the Communist Party and the formation of a "popular front," the Lien Viet, purportedly to achieve both "independence and democracy." Though there were devoted non-communists in the ranks of this war, there was never any question as to communist leadership and control.

By 1951, having established a common frontier with Red China, the mask was dropped. The Communist Party—the Lao Dong—was reestablished in public, and new war objectives were given. Instead of aiming for "independence and democracy," it was announced in all-too-familiar language that "The anti-imperialist and the anti-feudal fights are of equal importance."

In North Vietnam, this signalled the beginning of a campaign to completely communize the country. Americans should study this campaign to understand our adversaries, and to comprehend what their victory would mean to South Vietnam. The record is one of incredible savagery, violence and repression. Among the victims were many non-communists who had served in the Viet Minh against the French, and even some lifelong members of the Communist Party. Their theory of operation was—"It is better to kill ten innocent people than to let one enemy escape."

In 1954, the war between the French and the Viet Minh was concluded by the Geneva Accords—a set of truce arrangements to which neither South Vietnam nor the United States were official parties. The seeds of conflict in which we are now engaged were sown in the months and years immediately following the termination of this earlier conflict.

In the aftermath of Geneva, the Communists took to North Vietnam the bulk of their forces located south of the 17th Parallel and many of their southern supporters. But, significantly, they left behind secret cadres to serve as future focal points for renewed military and political action, and several thousand weapons caches for future use.

During this period, the myth that Ho Chi Minh was universally loved and supported by the Vietnamese people was shattered. This fact is important, since that same myth is again in circulation and is sometimes reinforced by misquoting a remark President Eisenhower made at the time of Geneva. It is claimed, erroneously, that he said Ho Chi Minh would win the votes of 80 percent of the Vietnamese people in a free election. This is false. President Eisenhower actually said that in an election against Emperor Bao Dai, Ho Chi Minh would gain such a vote.

The fact that the Vietnamese people would have almost certainly repudiated a French puppet—and did so in South Vietnam's 1956 Referendum—does not mean that the bulk of them revered Ho Chi Minh or would favor his leadership. It is important to remember that some 900,000 northerners, given the chance by provisions of the Geneva Accords, chose to leave their homes and flee to the south to avoid living under Ho's communist rule. Many more were denied escape when the communists recognized how damaging this exodus was to their image and ambitions.

This denial, incidentally, was a flagrant violation of the Geneva Accords.

In the first few years after Geneva, South Vietnam made strides toward stability and progress which were astonishing in light of the difficulties with which the South Vietnamese people and their new government had to cope. Despite the chaos of two decades of war, the legacy of colonial rule, the political inexperience, and endemic corruption, life in South Vietnam presented a contrast which was increasingly unflattering to that in North Vietnam. This was one of the main determinants of the communist decision to launch an insurgency which would stop South Vietnam's political evolution, recreate anarchy and chaos, and thus permit the establishment of communist power over the South Vietnamese people.

The Communist Party in Hanoi took several steps to implement this strategic decision. Cadres left behind in the south were ordered to renew political agitation and build up a political and terrorist structure. A ruthless campaign of terror was initiated, designed to undo the political progress that the government had made. Its particular targets were those local officials and workers, representatives of the Saigon government, whose dedicated activities were making some progress in improving the lot of the South Vietnamese peasantry. At the same time, the Party in Hanoi created a Reunification Department, placed it in command of a major general in the North Vietnamese Army, and gave him control over those ethnic southern supporters who had re-grouped to North Vietnam after 1954. This Department soon began dispatching these agents back to their native areas to reinforce the insurgent communist organization.

By 1959, the communists in North Vietnam were focusing publicly on their objective. "... We are building socialism in Vietnam" Ho Chi Minh said. "We are building it, however, only in half of the country, while in the other half we must still bring to a conclusion the democratic-bourgeois and anti-imperialist revolution." To these ends, Viet Cong agitation and terrorism were greatly accelerated, and infiltrators moved southward in ever greater numbers down the "Ho Chi Minh Trail." Six years ago, in 1961, the annual flow was already more than 10,000 men.

It is important to understand the identity and the mission of these infiltrators. Until 1964, they were almost exclusively ethnic southerners. It was they who built the political and military apparatus for the communists in the south, and it is they who usually still direct it at regional, provincial, and district levels. Although southern, they were devoted to communist objectives and subject to Party discipline. Without them, the communist movement could never have been developed into the force it is today. These men did not infiltrate spontaneously in response to legitimate southern grievances. Instead, they represented the cutting edge of a brilliantly conceived and ruthlessly executed campaign of politico-military aggression, developed by the Lao Dong Politburo in Hanoi, and completely controlled by Hanoi from its inception to the present day.

Thus, although it is true that many of those whom we fight in Vietnam are themselves South Vietnamese, and that substantial numbers of southerners support the enemy in some degree, it is not true, and never has been, that this is a simple civil conflict in which Hanoi took no role until after the United States had already intervened. From its inception, this insurgency has been run on Hanoi's orders to further Hanoi's political objectives. Viet Cong forces and the Viet Cong political organization are led by ruthless, hard-core communists who take orders from Hanoi. The ranks are filled,

in the main, by very young men who have been conscripted at gun point, and who are kept in line by unrelenting discipline in the field and unmistakable threats against their families at home. It is these threats, in turn, backed up by military force and deliberate terrorism, which account for the support given to the enemy in Viet Cong-controlled areas.

The events of recent years are too familiar to need much recounting. Exploiting the problems and weaknesses of South Vietnam, the communists moved to take over the land through subversion, terror, and mounting armed aggression. Well before the United States deployed major forces to South Vietnam at the request of its government, the flow of men and supplies from north to south had reached floodtide. And today, nearly half the enemy divisions in the south come from the North Vietnamese Army, and the Viet Cong ranks themselves are increasingly filled with northerners.

It is clear to me, then, that the war in Vietnam is no simple civil conflict. Its roots are traceable in history. Its mainspring, tactics, and even its language are familiar to all who have studied communism. It is an attempt by North Vietnam to impose an unwanted rule on a sovereign nation, an attempt clearly nourished by massive support from Red China, the Soviet Union, and other communist nations throughout the world.

In a word, what we see in Vietnam is aggression. There may be no precise, literal analogy which can be drawn to past aggressions because the form of aggression has changed. Massive conventional attack has been largely replaced by political subversion, intimidation, terrorism, and guerrilla attack. But the essential analogy remains, the hallmark of aggression remains the same—an attempt to impose political change by force of arms and without the consent of the people.

Next, it is essential to understand that this is a war of limited objectives. The confusion over these objectives is at least partly to blame for the attitudes of those citizens who are troubled by our participation and who oppose our effort. To understand clearly what our objectives are, perhaps we need to repeat again what they are not.

We are not seeking to destroy or change the government of North Vietnam. We do not want permanent bases in South Vietnam.

We do not want one inch of new territory for America.

We are not even seeking to enlist South Vietnam as a permanent ally in that portion of the world.

Our objective is limited. It is limited because we want to halt conflict in one place without precipitating it in others. And, in Vietnam, it is limited to assuring that South Vietnam can shape its own destiny, choose its own political and economic institutions, and do so without military pressure from external powers.

But what is the objective of the enemy? It is to force his own political solution on the South Vietnamese. This is at least implicit in his statements; it is explicit in his ideology and in his actions.

I spoke earlier of the grays in this struggle. But there is an area of vast importance in which there are no shadings. It is clear and indisputable. It concerns the way in which the war is fought.

It is a fact that brutality and wanton terrorism are deliberate tools of the communists in Vietnam, as they always have been. It is no error when the most talented members of a village are threatened, beaten, abducted, or forced to serve the enemy. It is no mistake when a village chief is made to watch his family murdered, and then has his head cut off. It is deliberate when the enemy destroys schools and medical dispensaries. It

is intentional when he attacks the hearts of cities. And the cumulative, innocent victims of these deliberate actions now number many thousands.

We, on our side, have made errors on occasion. We have injured innocent civilians in South Vietnam, and we have injured our own soldiers. But we have injured them by error, error inevitable in the course of conflict. And we have injured civilians in North Vietnam in bombing attacks. But they have been unintentional victims, hurt in attacks against military targets—attacks carried out with more restraint than any bombing attacks in history. Never has a nation had so much power as the United States today. But, most significantly, never has a nation so limited the power employed, or used it with such discrimination.

What we would like to do, for all Vietnamese, is best reflected in the countless kind acts of unsung soldiers, and civilians and the contributions to nation building, which now take place every day in South Vietnam.

Knowing these things—knowing the true face of the war, on both sides—I find it difficult to understand the convoluted logic which leads some to condemn this nation for "immorality" and to defend terrorism as a heroic struggle for "independence."

Still another issue in dispute concerns the efforts which have been made to achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam. Here, the contrast between our side and the other is sharply etched on the public record.

The communists, for their part, have said that discussions cannot even be begun without unilateral concessions by us. As they know, without reciprocal moves on their side, these concessions could exact a toll of blood from those who are defending South Vietnam. This is an unacceptable condition for achieving peace talks. Yet there are thoughtful Americans who believe we should accept it.

We cannot be that naive or take the chances implicit in such action. But we have, over the past several years, explored reasonable avenues to peace in Vietnam with more than half the nations on this earth. As Secretary Rusk has pointed out within the past week, the United States has agreed to some 28 separate peace proposals. These were not just American proposals, oriented to our own optimum interests. They were varied in content, with some having limited and some having broad objectives. They stemmed from many sources. They would have involved such agencies as the United Nations, the International Control Commission, the International Red Cross, a reconvened Geneva Conference, or an all-Asian Peace Conference. They would have called on the good offices of such individuals as the Secretary General of the United Nations or the Geneva Co-Chairmen. Nevertheless, the record is clear: The North Vietnamese rejected every proposal.

I cannot believe that there is any real doubt as to which side has taken the initiative for peace, and which has cast its lot with war.

I believe, then, that we are in a just war and are seeking to achieve an honorable peace.

But what of the second allegation of the divinity students, the allegation that this war is not in our national interest?

We live in a world which is at once filled with hope and despair, good chance and no chance, trust and mistrust, ease and hardship, security and peril, even peace and war at the same time. It is a world suddenly, and significantly, grown small. The hiding places are gone; each man's need is the concern of every man and each nation's problem is the burden of every nation. It is a complex world—interrelated, interdependent, in ferment, dynamic, and demanding much of those who must assume leadership.

In the small world today, the national interest of the United States is international.

Our role of leadership is inescapable. We cannot fulfill a meaningful destiny as an affluent but passive witness to great principles in contest.

We have, as you know, not been passive.

For more than 20 years we have made a major contribution to the security and stability of Western Europe. As a consequence, that area has prospered economically, and both peace and freedom have been preserved.

Again, in Korea, we stood fast for the principle of self-determination. While that land war in Asia went on, domestic critics were both numerous and vocal. Some wanted out; some wanted total war; and few could find reason or value in what we did. Yet, today, South Korea is freer than it has ever been, politically responsible, economically resurgent, and able to play a leading role in Asian affairs.

In Southeast Asia, as a further extension of our leadership role and our support of self-determination, we committed ourselves through the SEATO Treaty. We also committed ourselves, through the voices of three Presidents; to defense against aggression in South Vietnam.

All these commitments to principle, and our similar interests in other world areas, are interrelated. A principle worth defending any place, is worth supporting in other places. A promise kept in one place, gives integrity to promises made in other places. Aggression halted in one place, discourages aggression in other places. And what happens anywhere is known everywhere in the modern world of swift transport and rapid communication.

Can anyone truly doubt, in this world, that the struggles in Southeast Asia have their impact upon the internal struggles of Africa, the pressures of Europe, and even the peoples of the Western Hemisphere?

Would the success of military aggression in Southeast Asia, then, be in our national interest? What undermines peace in Southeast Asia undermines peace throughout the world.

Is it in our national interest to allow one large nation or nations to project their power across international boundaries by force of arms?

Would not the loss of independence of the 200 million persons in the nations of Southeast Asia constitute a serious shift in the balance of power against the free world?

This does not mean that we must become the policeman of the world.

It does mean that we must stand behind the commitments we have made if we hope to preserve peace rather than permit raw and naked power to govern. We act in our national interest when we stand behind those commitments; we act against our national interest when we do not.

In the time available, I have sketched in the outlines of my views. There is need for us all to ponder these issues in greater length and depth, and always with balanced perspective. For we must answer to our own people, and to history, for the conclusions we reach, the decisions we make, and the actions we take.

No one votes lightly for war, especially in the face of ambiguities which are more troublesome than the simplicities of earlier days. And the first vote of every responsible American today is for peace. But there is no peace in the surrender of principle, or in turning away from aggression; there is no honor in vacating solemn commitments; there is no morality in tolerating brutality; and there is no security or stability in isolation.

I would say to the young divinity students then: I share your abhorrence of war, but the sacrifice of principle and the loss of freedom are worse than the loss of life. Both principle and freedom are at stake in Vietnam, and so I believe that we are engaged in a just battle. I believe, too, that the na-

tional interest of a great nation is involved wherever principle, freedom, and the peace and stability of the world are imperiled. Thus, for these very reasons, I think we should be in Vietnam, and we should stay there until the aggression ends.

DEEF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall the strong support I gave to legislation in 1964 to strengthen restrictions against the importation of meat products. Although many of us agreed that legislation was as strong as we could hope to pass into law at that time, we expressed our determination to make an occasional review of how things were going in the delicate area of meat imports.

Despite the regulations which have been enacted, the trend in meat imports during the last 3 years has continued upward. We cannot allow imports from foreign countries to jeopardize the income of our farmers, and it is my belief that the time has come for a thorough review and for stricter limitations.

I am introducing legislation today which would further restrict meat imports. It would improve the existing law. Briefly, here are the changes which I recommend today.

Existing law allows for a 10-percent overrun before import quotas are legally applicable. I think considerable damage can be done before any action can be taken, and this legislation provides for elimination of the 10-percent overrun clause.

A second provision would remove from the Secretary of Agriculture the duty of estimating in advance the level of imports and determining whether it is likely they will exceed the quotas. This bill calls for quotas to be imposed by the law itself. It would eliminate the uncertainty of departmental predictions.

I also recommend changing the period on which our present quotas are based. Present quotas are based on imports during the 5-year period 1959-63. I do not think this is a representative period and my bill would base quotas on imports during the years from 1958 to 1962. The base would, therefore, be lowered from approximately 725 million pounds to approximately 585 million pounds.

Another change would call for quotas to be imposed quarterly instead of annually as under existing law. I am hopeful this adjustment will eliminate unduly heavy imports of meat products in any one season of the year.

I am also recommending that the administration be given the power to impose quotas on importation of meats not covered in the legislation if these imports should become a threat to domestic producers. This would be effective in situations in which the Congress may not be able to act swiftly enough.

Finally, this bill provides that meat purchases abroad by the Department of Defense for use of our troops abroad will be charged against import quotas for such meats.

Our meat producers are plagued by low income and I believe the industry, as a whole, is in serious trouble. Rural America must continue to be a primary consideration of our Government. Solutions to the rural-income problem must be found, and the longer we wait the more difficult it will be to achieve effective and equitable solutions. I hope my colleagues in the House will join in support of this legislation. Believe me, our farmers need it.

KNOCK ON THE DOOR OF A HOME IN CALUMET CITY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Calumet City is in the district that I have the honor to represent. This is the story of a morning knock on the door of a home in Calumet City that the Chicago Tribune thought enough of to put on the first page of its edition of May 8, 1967, under a three-column headline. To William Granger, the writer, John P. Granger, the soldier, and the sister in Calumet City go my warmest greetings. The article follows:

A KNOCK AT THE DOOR—YOUNG BROTHER IS HOME FROM WAR (By William Granger)

This is a story about Viet Nam. It is not about a victory or defeat, or death, or bombing. It is good news.

My brother came home from the war Saturday.

My sister called me at work: "I just wanted to let you know Johnnie came home this morning. He's sleeping now."

Other brothers and sons and husbands came home from the war this week-end as he did, safe and well, and their families knew what I felt that afternoon.

YEAR OF WATCHING LISTS

And I know some of what those families feel about whose kin are still there because during his year overseas, I read the death lists in the newspaper and listened to the radio for that day's battle and where it was and wrote letters with blind faith that they would be answered.

And I know some of what those families feel whose kin did not come back because of my own reckless dreams at night or a sudden thought during the day: What if he were dead now?

After he woke up Saturday night and after I left work, I called him. I didn't want to see him then because he has a fiancée and he would want to see her.

We did not know what to talk about. I asked him how he was and he said fine and he asked me how I was.

He had not told anyone when he was coming home exactly. I think I understand why. We had our own calculations and calendars to mark and we expected him in a few weeks.

A KNOCK AT THE DOOR

He got off the plane Saturday morning and went to my sister's house in Calumet

City and knocked on the door and went inside and had some coffee. He called my mother, who lives in Wisconsin, and she cried. Then he went to sleep.

While we talked, I mentioned I was working odd hours the last few weeks.

"Not as odd as mine," he said. Then he laughed.

He was not decorated in the war. He was drafted two years ago, just as I was getting out of the army. The army sent him to school and gave him leave and then sent him to the APO and then sent him to Viet Nam.

When he landed he wrote a funny letter about the boat trip over.

We sent him the papers and told him about the Big Snow and told him what we were doing. He wrote back and would say he was well and ask about us.

AN ORDINARY SOLDIER

He did not win a medal. He was an ordinary soldier.

His voice sounded different when I talked to him on the phone. But maybe it was the telephone.

We were going to get together this morning before I went to work to talk.

But he called my sister yesterday and said he was taking the train home to Wisconsin to see our mother.

He will never forget the war and in a different way, neither will I, because he was there.

But maybe today, at home, he will forget it.

NEW BILL TO AMEND VESSEL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a staunch supporter and advocate of a strong American merchant marine. However, like other Members of the House, I have an even greater allegiance to the principle that "John Q. Public," the taxpayer, is entitled to have his tax dollars protected and spent in the most efficient manner. For this reason, I am compelled to introduce today a bill designed to remedy what to me appears to be maladministration of a law and in contravention of the intent of Congress.

Two years ago our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported to the House a bill to extend and broaden the vessel exchange program of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That legislation was favorably acted upon by this body and by the Senate becoming Public Law 89-254. It then was my understanding, and I believe that of many of my colleagues on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that when we broadened the provisions of this program, it was to meet a specific problem concerning obsolete vessels in operation on the Great Lakes. The hearings before our committee on this earlier legislation support this view.

It now has come to my attention that this well-meaning piece of legislation has been so liberally construed as to totally disregard congressional intent. Ferryboats, which in many instances have been nonoperative over a period of time,

have been held to be eligible for trade-in and have been used as a credit in computing the net cost of large oceangoing Government-owned cargo vessels received in exchange. These ferryboats have come to be known in the jargon of the maritime industry as "box tops"—a token needed to qualify for the transfer out from our reserve fleet of Government-owned vessels, since a direct sale is not permitted under the existing law.

Based on current information, I am constrained to view such questionable practices as nothing more than a ruse. It presents the appearance of gimmickry simply to circumvent the prohibition on the direct sale of Government vessels. Although I recognize the need for additional shipping capability as a result of the demands of Vietnam, and that this liberal interpretation of the vessel exchange program may serve to meet these needs, I would have hoped that the Maritime Administration would have taken a more direct and honest approach to the matter. If such a need exists, then why, I ask, has not the Maritime Administration requested an appropriate amendment to the law to allow direct sale of Government vessels? Either the law should be properly interpreted and administered, or it should be changed. There should be no subterfuge undercutting either the intent of the Congress or giving cause for anyone to question the possibility of the existence of a windfall to participants in this vessel exchange program.

I inquired into this matter by letter to the general counsel of the Maritime Administration. The answer which I received indirectly took the form of a 12-page letter which unfortunately was not satisfactory in my opinion and did not serve to assuage my well-intentioned concern over this matter.

Perhaps the greatest significance in the reply from the general counsel of the Maritime Administration was in but two of the many paragraphs of his somewhat lengthy letter. One of these paragraphs simply indicated that the lack of the new construction of American vessels had reduced the number of eligible vessels to be traded in under the vessel exchange program. This only points up the need for a reasonable and adequate program of new merchant vessel construction. The second paragraph of significance quoted portions of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which held that:

The reference in the National Transportation Policy of the Interstate Commerce Act (40 U.S.C. 1) to the objective of preserving a transportation system "adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States . . . and of the national defense" is not merely a "hoped-for end", but an operative policy which must be followed in the administration of the act in a case involving the welfare of coastwise shipping of the United States. *Interstate Commerce Commission v. New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co.*, 372 U.S. 744, 761 (1963).

Well, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the General Counsel of the Maritime Administration the words of this Supreme Court decision in the administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It, too, is not simply a "hoped-for end." Rather,

when enacted it was designed to be an "operative policy" which over the years has been frustrated and maligned by a marked disregard for congressional intent—a disregard which is exemplified by this latest example in the administration of the vessel exchange program.

I, for one, have no desire to be a party to such a questionable transaction. Accordingly, I am introducing today legislation designed to bring this matter once more before our Committee on Merchant Marine. I sincerely hope that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, will see fit to hold early hearings on my bill, so as to rectify what now appears to be a gross error in the interpretation of the intent of the Congress by an executive agency charged with the administration of the law.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would clarify that vessels traded in under section 510(i) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 must have been in operation for the 365-day period prior to the date of exchange, either as an ocean-going cargo vessel or as a cargo vessel in use exclusively on the Great Lakes. This was the intent of Congress, as I understood it, when the trade-in law was passed.

ADEQUATE CAPITOL

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the Members of Congress, and in particular, the Members of the most populous side of the Capitol, that is, the House, where we have 435 Members, the time has come to decide whether this Capitol Building is going to be a museum or whether it is going to be a functioning, living instrument of our Government. This Capitol Building has had to grow many times in the past to accommodate the growth of this great Nation—1803, the completion of the original building; 1817, the restoration of the burned building; 1859, the addition of the House and Senate wings; 1861, completion of new dome; 1961 completion of west front.

We have many functions that have to work to make the Congress work in the numerous offices for clerks, attendants, and for important committees—Ways and Means, Rules, and Appropriations. Of course, the work is growing for everybody because the country is growing at a more rapid rate than ever before in its history.

A particular fact is the terrible inadequacy of eating facilities. It is becoming increasingly embarrassing that a Congressman cannot lunch with his constituents in the Capitol Building. This is increasingly inconvenient and embarrassing because our work is more and more commanding with attendance on the House floor commencing at noon every weekday.

I think we owe it to our constituents

when they travel far to visit their Congressman that there be dining facilities where they can lunch and visit their views upon their Congressman. I think that we, of course, should listen to the architects on the question of the appearance of the building. I think we should retain the outward appearance of the building as nearly as engineeringly possible, but the growth of the building, to meet the growth of the Nation and the growth of the needs of a functioning, living Congress has got to be the decision of the Congress. We know that we need more room here in this building. We cannot give in to sentimentalism and make this building a museum. Were this building to become a museum, the needs of the Congress would demand that we build a new building, and move to new quarters. I think the result of moving to new quarters would be to neglect the care of these quarters. I wonder if the architects would be listened to at all if the clamor was that the Congress remain in Philadelphia? How ridiculous it would be that we remain in the original quarters of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia.

Finally, we have no other place to meet. Here is the Hall of the House of Representatives to be accommodated.

AID PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, I wrote Mr. William S. Gaud, Director of the Agency for International Development and asked for answers to 13 questions. Because the answers to these questions may be of interest to many Members in studying the Foreign Economic Assistance Act that is now before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my questions and the answers which Mr. Gaud furnished. My questions concerned food production, population control, and the development of the private sector in the developing countries:

Question 1: How many mission directors of AID have had college or graduate training in agriculture?

Answer: Of the 38 Mission Directors on the rolls as of February 28, 1967, two had college or graduate degrees in Agriculture.

Question 2: How many of their staff members have had this specialized training in agriculture?

Answer: A study made in October, in connection with another subject, showed that at least 286 employees overseas had their highest degree in Agriculture.

Question 3: What percentage of the AID direct-hire staff within developing countries is devoted full time to agricultural problems? Please give breakdown between Washington staff and staff within developing countries.

Answer: The following table summarizes the situation as of February 28, 1967:

	Direct-hires	Agriculturists	Percentage
Overseas.....	4,525	535	11.8
United States.....	3,657	53	1.45
Total.....	8,182	588	

These figures exclude, of course, clerical and secretarial support, personnel from other U.S. departments and agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, and the many contract personnel engaged in agricultural activities.

Question 4: What specific progress in the past six years can you report in the developing countries receiving our aid in regard to food output?

Answer: The index of total food production in the developing countries has risen from 110 in 1961 to 123 in 1966 (1957=100).

Progress in some countries, of course, has been more marked than in others. In the last decade, for example, agricultural production has risen 82% in Korea. In Turkey, in just a one-year period (1965-1966), agricultural production increased 11%.

Likewise, progress within most countries is more marked in particular geographic regions or for particular crops. For example, a large program in cooperation with the Pakistan Government in East Pakistan has enabled many farmers almost to triple production within three years.

But the major fact of life relating to food production in the less developed countries is the offsetting effect of rising populations. Population increases in many developing countries is equal to or greater than food increases. This means that food production per capita has stood about still over the last six years in the developing countries. The index of per capita food production in the less developed countries was 102 in 1962, and in 1966 it was 101. In 1957-1959 it was 100.

The balance between food and mouths is therefore today the number one priority of AID programs.

Question 5: I understand that only a tiny percentage of the students from Latin American Universities who study in the United States specialize in agriculture. What have we been doing to reverse this trend?

Answer: A.I.D. financed international training programs in the United States expose participants from less developed countries to a variety of studies and practices. A significant number, however, concentrate their time in a study of agriculture.

From FY 1965 through the first half of FY 1967, 5,647 Latin American participants financed directly by A.I.D. arrived in the U.S.; 1,088 of these specialized in agriculture. Of the 117 Latin Americans who arrived in the first half of FY 1967, and undertook regular academic courses, 24 of these have concentrated on agricultural matters. In addition, 40 out of 238 contract arrivals in the first half of FY 1967 likewise have concentrated on agricultural matters, mainly at U.S. universities.

While these programs have proved productive, the trend within A.I.D. is to train Latin Americans in agriculture in their home countries, rather than in the U.S. In this way local or regional institutions are created which will first, outlast the life of U.S. assistance, and second, concentrate on the particular and peculiar obstacles to increased food production in their own area.

Question 6: I understand that in 1962 only 187 of the students of the 10,000 students in Central America attending universities there were studying agriculture. To me this shows that the field of agriculture is not receiving the attention or official encouragement it should locally. What have we done since 1962 to reverse this trend?

Answer: In the case of agricultural education in Central America there have been several institutional developments. Faculties of agronomy have been established at the National Universities in Nicaragua and El Salvador in the past few years. The Regional School of Veterinary Medicine at San Carlos University in Guatemala has been established and with A.I.D. assistance is gradually becoming a viable institution. Existing agricultural education facilities in Costa Rica and Honduras have received technical assistance from A.I.D.

Question 7: It is further my understanding that the percentage of students in Central American Universities studying agriculture has been dropping rather than increasing.

Answer: While we are unable to identify your figures, data available to us shows an absolute increase in numbers of students enrolled in agriculture with a negligible decrease in percentage from 1961 to 1964. It is anticipated that future statistics will reflect the impact of the actions noted above.

Question 8: Is the promotion of basic human liberties set forth in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights one of the objectives of our AID program? If so, what specifically has AID been doing or attempting to do in this regard?

Answer: The promotion of the specific basic human liberties set forth in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not specifically mentioned in the legislation governing A.I.D. programs. The Declaration of 1948 was a statement of principles to serve as a guide for domestic policy.

Nonetheless, an ultimate objective of all A.I.D. programs is the evolution of economic, social and political conditions which are most conducive to the thriving of the specific human rights enumerated in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Through a variety of A.I.D. tools and programs, we work with less developed countries to further economic, social and political progress and justice for the widest possible number of peoples.

To cite a few examples, A.I.D. is involved in strengthening and promoting democratic institutions vital to development and individual participation in the development process. Programs for community development, mass literacy, civil service reforms, labor leadership and the like have now been brought together for special coordination and promotion under Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act of last year. A.I.D. programs to foster local initiative and private enterprise work, in the long run, to promote the objectives of the UN Declaration.

Question 9: Has AID imposed any firm requirements of birth control measures in any of the countries receiving our aid? Are any such requirements being negotiated at the present time? Do you have any future plans to impose any such firm requirements?

Answer: A.I.D. does not require that countries receiving assistance from the United States adopt measures for family planning or birth control. It has not had any such requirement in the past and President Johnson has clearly stated that the USA will not coerce any nation to practice family planning. As the President stated in his Foreign Aid Message to the Congress on February 1, 1966, "The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this [population problem]."

Assistance by A.I.D. for the population programs of developing countries is guided by the following principles:

1. Assistance is given only at request of each recipient country and is extended only as a supplement to the country's own self-help efforts in the population field.

2. Help is given only for programs and projects in which individual participation is wholly voluntary and in which each individual, who chooses to participate is free to

select methods of family planning which are in keeping with his or her religious beliefs, culture and personal wishes.

3. A.I.D. does not advocate any specific population policy for another country, nor any particular method of family planning or birth control. The Agency's aim is to provide needed assistance upon request so that people may have the fundamental freedom of controlling their reproduction if they so desire.

Within this framework, A.I.D. may provide requested assistance for collection of needed population data in assisted countries, provide technical help in analysis of population problems, and supply technical and advisory assistance for population programs, training, and research. In addition, it may supply commodity assistance, as for vehicles and educational aids, and may give local currency assistance. Also, it cooperates with other assisting institutions, such as United Nations agencies, the Pan American Health Organization, and other organizations, in helping meet the full needs of countries engaged in self-help action in this field.

Question 10: To what extent has the AID program succeeded in strengthening marketing prices so that farmers in developing countries have an incentive to produce food? To what extent has the operation of the P.L. 480 program tended to depress market prices? I cite in particular India although other countries would be equally important.

Answer: As the question implies, the price level for farm produce is one of many key factors in the level of food production in the less developed countries. It is clear that the farmer will have no incentive to produce food for the market if sales do not result in adequate profits. There is a thorough awareness of this basic consideration among A.I.D. officials and technicians. Where farm prices are not adequate to provide necessary incentive, this is of great concern to A.I.D. planners.

One way to strengthen market prices is to help the farmer himself to influence these prices. A.I.D. programs in a number of countries have done just that:

In Bolivia, A.I.D. organized the Rice Marketing Committee which then offered rice producers a guaranteed minimum price. As a result, Bolivia is now self-sufficient in rice. She previously had to import one-third of her requirements.

An A.I.D. technical assistance project in Guatemala led to institution of a radio program in Indian dialect which broadcasts market news. This has put small farmers in a significantly improved bargaining position with commodity speculators.

A rice floor price in the Dominican Republic was instituted by the Agricultural Bank, through an A.I.D. loan. Rice production is expected to increase 15% as a result. Similar plans are moving ahead for bean and corn prices.

Throughout the less developed world A.I.D.-funded marketing and deficit cooperatives have enabled farmers to influence market prices by affecting the level of market supply. Similarly, and more specifically, an A.I.D. project in Nepal has resulted in the building of grain storage facilities which enable the farmer to store grains away until prices increase.

A second, and more direct way A.I.D. programs have strengthened market prices for the farmer is by actually arguing, persuading and showing government officials the importance of policies which create incentives for the farmer. This has been done in a number of countries either through daily contact with host government officials or through advisory groups or high-level U.S. consultants. In any list of countries where A.I.D. has been successful in influencing higher market price policies, Thailand, Taiwan, Korea, Pakistan and India would be included. A.I.D. program loan negotiations in India

have likewise led to changes in Indian Government policies affecting prices for the farmer.

As to the effect of PL 480 shipments on market prices, this is difficult to answer, because the effect is not really measurable. To some extent, at least, it is probably true that past PL 480 shipments dampened the incentive of some less developed countries to increase their own food production. In a few countries—India is no doubt an example—large supplies of U.S. foods did tend to decrease farm prices. In most countries, however, shipments were too small in relation to total supply to influence prices to any degree.

Under the current PL 480 program, self-help efforts by recipient countries are being strongly emphasized, and PL 480 programs are being watched closely to avoid any disincentive effects. And A.I.D. itself is making greater efforts than ever before to get governments to help raise farm prices where an adequate profit incentive is required to increase farm production. It is significant that food prices have risen since last summer in both Pakistan and India, despite large PL 480 shipments.

Question 11: What achievements can AID cite in its effort to establish an entrepreneurial class in developing countries? What further measures are being undertaken in this regard?

Answer:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: Thank you for your letter of February 20, requesting specific information on our foreign aid programs as they relate to the development of an entrepreneurial class in the developing nations.

A.I.D.'s programs as a whole are oriented very strongly to the development of the local private sectors. We recognize that, without exception, the countries that have grown most rapidly have been those where public policy and public investments have spurred private initiative on the farm and in the factories.

As illustrated in the enclosed "Private Resources for International Development," a chapter from our Summary Presentation for Fiscal 1967, direct assistance to the private sectors is accomplished in many ways and through the administration of many programs:

A.I.D. program loans finance the import (from the United States) of a great variety of goods, raw materials, components and spare parts, making it possible for hundreds of small and medium-size, privately-owned enterprises in the less-developed countries to obtain the materials they need for new investment or current operations. And, by making such loans conditional on the adoption by the countries concerned of more liberal policies toward the private sector (elimination of rigid and inequitable import controls, for example) we have tried to further improve the climate for private development.

A.I.D. has also provided, both through loans and technical assistance, for the creation or expansion of local sources of capital for private ventures in the form of intermediate credit institutions—industrial, agricultural and housing development banks. In addition to direct loans, A.I.D. has secured the co-operation of local governments in earmarking portions of the local currencies generated by program loans for the establishment of further credit facilities through local Private Investment Funds. From 1958 to date, a total of \$730.6 million has been lent to 100 institutions for relending to local private borrowers.

Through the assistance of experienced private U.S. organizations and their technical

experts, A.I.D. has assisted in the development of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan institutions to make more investment capital available at the grass roots level. A.I.D. is now in relationship, through contracting organizations, with all major national, regional and local cooperatives in the United States. These organizations supplied some two-thirds of the 357 advisors and consultants working on A.I.D. cooperative projects in 54 countries. During 1966 A.I.D. assistance affected 30,000 cooperatives and credit institutions with 9.8 million members in 46 countries. Some 2,500 new cooperatives with 500,000 members were organized, most of them agricultural.

A.I.D.'s many programs of technical assistance, training, and research services to private investment institutions, productivity centers, trade associations, and business schools are designed to help local private industry improve its technology, help local investors locate sound investment opportunities and industry groups improve the quality of their output and the marketing of their products. As examples of the many ways in which technical assistance is used to assist private sector growth, recently authorized projects are designed to:

- help Korean industrialists expand their exports through improved quality control;
- set up a productivity and investment center in Paraguay;
- develop small indigenous industries in Nigeria;

- improve the capacity of the private sector in Chile to participate in national planning;
- stimulate the formation of democratically oriented labor unions in Latin American countries and in Africa.

- assist Brazil in drafting comprehensive capital markets legislation;

- develop a modern graduate school of business administration in Peru.

As of September 30, 1966, A.I.D. had 1,489 technical service contracts with private groups with a total value of some \$509 million to carry out projects in 73 countries. Within this group 127 American colleges and universities held 307 contracts valued at some \$220 million for research, surveys, training and technical assistance.

A.I.D.'s international training program provides for the specialized training of foreign technicians and professionals in the United States or in third countries. Since the beginning of the Point IV program in 1949, 97,000 such participants have been brought to the United States for advanced education or training, and another 19,000 have been trained in third countries.

In recognition of the major role in development that can and should be played by American private enterprise, which has unequaled resources of managerial, technological and entrepreneurial skills to transmit to business partners in less-developed countries, A.I.D. administers a broad range of programs to encourage and assist private U.S. investment in productive enterprises in these countries. Our programs of information services, investment survey participation, investment insurance and guaranties, and local currency and dollar loans to private firms are described in the enclosed AIDS TO BUSINESS (OVERSEAS INVESTMENT), which is widely distributed in this country.

We are sure you will be interested to learn, for example, that while A.I.D. is obligated for \$725,000 as its share of 80 completed investment surveys in which the investment decision was negative, 31 affirmative decisions have been made representing \$70 million in planned investment. Thus for each dollar of appropriated funds, \$90 in private investment has been generated. Outstanding coverage under the specific risk insurance program rose from \$479 million in 1961 to \$3.1 billion by the end of 1966. New investment covered under this program in 1966 totalled \$250 million.

To strengthen private cooperation for development between American business and private enterprise in the less-developed countries, A.I.D. has strongly supported the establishment and growth of the International Executive Service Corps, a private, non-profit organization directed and managed by American businessmen. The IESC provides experienced American volunteers to help private firms in the less-developed countries to improve their management, production, and marketing. During 1966 IESC received 367 requests from businesses, large and small, in 37 developing countries. The Service Corps has a roster of 2,150 experienced businessmen, recruited by unpaid representatives of business in 38 American cities.

To some degree most A.I.D. programs exert a forceful, if indirect, influence on the development of an entrepreneurial class. A.I.D.'s project loans for the development of needed infrastructure help create the power, transportation facilities, etc., that open the way for industrial development; our programs of health, education, and agricultural production assist in the growth of a healthier, better-educated populace and the creation of a more favorable climate for entrepreneurial growth.

As indicated, A.I.D.'s effort to improve and develop private sector growth cut across nearly all functional and organizational lines within the agency, making it extremely difficult to isolate and list those personnel concerned solely with entrepreneurial growth. However we are enclosing a list of certain AID/Washington offices primarily concerned with this area, together with the total number of positions and personnel funding.

As to an evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs, it is our feeling that much is being accomplished. Those countries which are developing most rapidly are those where government policies, investments of self-generated savings, and external assistance have combined to bring the creative forces of private initiative into full play... for example, Taiwan, Israel, Greece, and now Pakistan, Peru and Korea. Awareness of this truth underlies A.I.D.'s entire program, and further it has sharpened the Agency's appreciation of its role in encouraging and assisting the widest possible participation in development by other American groups—State and local governments, private business and non-profit organizations. An Office of Private Resources is being established in A.I.D. to coordinate the relations of the Agency with private groups and to strive for broader participation from them.

Much remains to be done. However in little more than a decade, new nations have moved from doctrinaire reliance on state enterprise to a pragmatic support of private initiative.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of such programs is a continuing process, stimulated particularly in the summer of 1965 by the thoughtful and substantive report and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid (the Watson Committee.) Many of the Committee's recommendations (particularly those relating to our investment guaranty programs) have been put into effect; the others are being carefully studied. I am enclosing a copy of the Committee's report, and a report on the status of its recommendations as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18, 1966. A further and more comprehensive report on the work accomplished to date is now in preparation, and a copy will be sent to you just as soon as it is available.

In response to your last question, we would say there are no areas in which efforts to promote a private entrepreneurial class would be inadvisable or impractical; there may be a question of the degree to which such efforts can be successful at a given time. When a country government might have policies which hamper free development of private

enterprise, or when current economic conditions such as rampant inflation, etc., might stifle development opportunities, it may be necessary to concentrate first on assisting in the correction of these specific detrimental conditions. The end result of such assistance, however, is intended to be the creation of a climate in which private enterprise can thrive and in which direct assistance to the private sector can bear fruit.

I hope this information is helpful, and that you will let us know whenever this office can be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. GIBBONS,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

AID/Washington office with particular responsibility for private sector development: Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise.

Bureau for Africa—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Bureau for Africa—Office of Private Enterprise.

Bureau for Near East and South Asia—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Bureau for Latin America—Office of Capital Development.

Bureau for Latin America—Private Sector Development Division.

Bureau for Far East—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Office of International Training.

International Cooperative Development Service.

Current Positions: 474.

Salaries: \$5,639,349.

Total A.I.D.: Current Positions: 3,795.

Salaries: \$44,097,300.

Question 12: If as argued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, famine conditions on a rather wide spread scale are effected by 1984, can the United States justify using any of its AID or P.L. 480 resources for projects that are not directly related to food production?

Answer: There are two main points that should be emphasized:

1. Projects not directly related to food production are many times necessary to break bottlenecks that stand in the way of directly increasing food production. Increased use of fertilizer, for example, requires, among other things, increased production of fertilizer. Increased production requires the building of fertilizer plants which in turn requires inputs from the steel industry, the chemical industry and even the education system. In addition, at all stages transportation facilities are required: farm-to-market roads to get the fertilizer in and the produce out, even perhaps port facilities to get raw materials to the fertilizer plants and to the suppliers. Also, marketing and credit facilities, plus adequate price incentives and perhaps additional education are necessary to induce the farmer to use the fertilizer and everyone else to want to supply it to him. A bottleneck anywhere along the line could slow down the use of fertilizer by the farmer. The main point is that the agricultural sector does not exist as an independent, autonomous unit; it is interrelated in a complex way with the rest of the economy. If many of the nonagricultural sectors do not grow in a more or less balanced way, the agricultural sector itself cannot grow.

2. There are two ways for a country to acquire more food: grow it itself or produce more of something else and trade it for food produced in other countries. The choice between the two should depend on resource endowments. A land-rich country should—all things being equal—specialize in the production of food and trade with a land-poor country whose comparative advantage may lie in an entirely different field. Chile, for example, has good supplies of phosphate and copper and relatively poor land, at least in comparison with its neighbor Argentina, for

example. While everything should be done to increase yields in Chile so long as it is efficient to do so, food output in both countries will be maximized by inducing Chile to concentrate on phosphate and copper production while Argentina concentrates on food production, perhaps utilizing Chilean phosphate and copper for this purpose. To do otherwise would be to waste resources just at a time when we cannot afford to do so.

Question 13: In negotiating AID projects, has our government made any attempt to negotiate the release of U.S. owned local currencies for purposes other than the ones specified in the P.L. 480 agreement under which the currency is acquired? Give details.

Answer: PL 480 local currency sales agreements specify three general purposes for which proceeds are to be used: (1) U.S. Uses—primarily payment of U.S. expenses in the country, (2) Loans to private enterprise, and (3) Loans or grants to the foreign government for economic development, for the common defense and for population control programs. In determining the distribution of currencies for these general purposes, first priority is given to the need for U.S. use currency and to the demand for private loan funds. The specific purposes for which amounts set aside for loans or grants to the foreign government will be used are not usually spelled out in detail in PL 480 sales agreements. For example, the agreements usually provide only that a percentage of sales proceeds will be made available for loans to promote multilateral trade and agricultural and other economic development. This provides sufficient latitude for US AID Missions to reach agreement with the foreign governments on the specific programs or projects for which loan funds will be used without the necessity of renegotiating the PL 480 agreement. In many instances, the problem is a shortage of local currency generated by PL 480 or otherwise available to foreign governments for economic development, the common defense, etc. rather than one of insisting that PL 480 currencies be used for purposes not included in the sales agreement.

SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate Republican policy committee released an in depth historical study of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam entitled "The War in Vietnam." Only 500 copies of this report were printed and they were quickly exhausted. Only brief excerpts of the report appeared in the press. This report has been critically reviewed, praised by some and condemned by others.

It is, I feel, a significant document that merits thorough examination. It deals with the background and future course of America's longest war—a conflict that is costing about \$25 billion a year and has already taken over 9,000 American lives.

In order that each person may make his own individual judgment on the re-

port, I believe it should have the widest possible circulation. Accordingly, I have asked that the full text be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman, Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., staff director, April 1967)

INTRODUCTION

Dimensions of the war

As of April 1967, the war to contain Communist aggression in Vietnam has assumed for the United States these unusual dimensions:

It means a conflict that has escalated from a small force of 600 American technicians to over a half-million fighting men.

It means over 8,000 men killed.

It means over 50,000 wounded.

It means greatly increased American conscription at a time when the rest of the Western world has done away with its draft.

It means our longest war since the American Revolution—six years—a weary nightmare and yet the men who fight are fighting with extraordinary bravery and skill.

It means not knowing at any given moment precisely who the enemy is.

It means a war which is not simply fought over this tiny land of Vietnam; for this war, unlike all others in American history, is more and more justified as much on geopolitical grounds as on the defense of one small government.

It means our relative isolation as the world's policeman, for here we have no Grand Alliance as in World War II, no United Nations Combined Forces as in Korea. In addition to South Vietnamese troops, four Pacific nations have provided some fighting help—with our financial assistance.

It means fighting a people who claim this is a civil war, and who in turn are spurred on by two giant powers quarreling openly with each other.

It means that while we have committed 500,000 men to battle communism, neither the Soviet Union nor Red China—the great Communist powers—has found it necessary to commit troops.

It means the most frustrating sort of war, with no front lines, which breaks out here and there, even across national borders in Laos and Cambodia, neither of which is involved.

It means spending over \$300,000 to kill each enemy soldier.

It means spending \$24 billion a year, with another increase in taxes threatened, a further drain on an already inadequate gold supply, and an escalation of inflation.

It means enormous discretionary powers assumed by the President, with Congress asked to approve his actions after the fact.

It means the Nation which started the war—France—and lost it, now has become our most outspoken critic while profiting heavily from the war.

It means a war where, in the eyes of many Asiatics, we are fighting against indigenous Asiatic nationalism, much as France did in the past.

It means the first war in our history fought not only on the battlefield but brought into the American livingroom, every day, through the raw emotionalism of today's mass communications.

It means a war in which religious controversy between Catholic minority and Buddhist majority has come dangerously close to causing collapse of the successive governments of South Vietnam.

Here at home this confusion, this frustration, has raised challenges within Congress, within colleges and universities, within the press, within the military itself—and all to a degree not experienced in the United States since the Civil War. Conscientious objectors

today outnumber their Korean counterparts 4 to 1.

PART I

Vietnam is a 2,000 year old country which, because of its exposed position, has been invaded by the Mongols, the Chinese, the Siamese, the French, the Japanese. One of the few things uniting the 30 million Vietnamese is a strong, common tradition of fighting outsiders.

The longest, most recent, most oppressive occupation—from the Vietnamese viewpoint—is still fresh in the minds of most Vietnamese. That occupation was by France; a white, western, capitalist, Christian power. America, no matter how pure its motives, cannot overcome the weight of history insofar as the Vietnamese look at it. In short, their memory of history is what we must learn to deal with, not our concept of it.

The crucial era

The most crucial moments in Vietnam's recent history came at the close of World War II, and are among the least remembered. The critical events of this era—the genesis of today's conflict—bear recounting in the strictest historical terms, complicated though they may be.

For nearly two decades prior to World War II Vietnamese, directed in large measure by Ho Chi Minh, an exiled Communist from Annam, had carried on an underground struggle for independence from France.

Ho Chi Minh became the principal rallying agent for underground factions when the Japanese conquered Indochina during World War II.

The World War II pattern of Axis conquest, that of setting up local, native puppet regimes (Quisling in Norway, Laval in France) was broken in Indochina. The Japanese found a tractable colonial bureaucracy running the country, that of the Vichy French; they took advantage of it, and for a time allowed the French to continue doing business at the same stand, but with new directors. Not all the French in Indochina were so ready to cooperate. Many were secretly allied with the Free French under De Gaulle.

Both the United States and Nationalist China openly recognized Ho as leader of the free Indochina movement during World War II. We supplied Ho's forces, the Vietminh, with arms and advisors.

Because of the Atlantic Charter and the outspoken United States stance in opposition to colonialism, the Vietminh and all Vietnamese had reason to expect U.S. support for their claim to independence following World War II. They had, after all, fought on our side—against both Japan and Vichy France.

Toward the end of the war, alarmed by the growing strength of the independence movement, Japan set up a puppet Vietnam government under the Emperor of Annam, Bao Dai.

Aftermath of Potsdam

The Potsdam Agreement provided that Chinese Nationalist troops were to disarm and intern Japanese forces north of the 16th parallel. British troops were to perform the same task in the south.

On September 2, 1945—following the Japanese collapse—Ho Chi Minh proclaimed from Hanoi the independence of all Vietnam. Bao Dai resigned, offered to serve the new government of independent Vietnam, and was appointed as an advisor.

British occupation forces, under Major General Douglas Gracey, put their own interpretation on the Potsdam Agreement and proceeded first to rearm, and then to use defeated Japanese troops to throw representatives of the newly proclaimed independent Vietnam government out of Saigon.

The consequences of this decision are with us today.

Thereafter, the British rearmed approxi-

mately 5,000 French troops interned in Saigon. On September 23, 1945, the British allowed the French *coup d'etat*, returning southern Vietnam to its colonial position under Paris rule.

British and Japanese troops supported the French in battle against Vietnamese units until enough French reinforcements—50,000 of them—arrived by December of 1945 to reestablish total French domination in the south.

Commenting on the use of Japanese soldiers to reestablish European colonialism, General Douglas A. MacArthur is reported to have said:

"If there is anything that makes my blood boil, it is to see our Allies in Indochina and Java deploying Japanese troops to reconquer the little people we promised to liberate. It is the most ignoble kind of betrayal."

An eight-year colonial war

Thereafter began an eight-year colonial war which did not then attract general attention in the United States. We were deeply involved elsewhere.

We were, in 1946, attempting unsuccessfully to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Soviet Union. The Cold War had begun.

In 1947, through the Marshall Plan, we were trying to rebuild a shattered Europe. This same year we had to move with arms and men to yet another Cold War frontier, the Greek and Anatolian Peninsulas.

In 1948, one more Iron Curtain rang down—this time over Czechoslovakia—necessitating the establishment of NATO to defend the rest of free Europe from Communist aggression. A few months later we were in the grim struggle to save West Berlin—and West Germany—by means of the Berlin airlift.

As for Asia, our attention was riveted on the war between Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists for control of mainland China. In terms of stakes in the Cold War, our commitments were elsewhere than Indochina. While we occasionally urged France to grant independence to these peoples—as we ourselves had already done for the Philippines—our prime concern was to secure French cooperation in forming NATO. Since France was absolutely vital to the success of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and was a permanent member of the U.N., we found it inappropriate to nudge France on the matter of colonialism in quite the same fashion as we did with the Netherlands in Java.

In 1949, the Communists had conquered mainland China, igniting a stormy debate within the United States. It was obvious that a nation of 3.7 billion square miles, bursting with half a billion people, under aggressive Communist leadership, had to be contained. This containment of Chinese expansion was to become the key aspect of President Truman's Asia policy.

France argued that while Ho Chi Minh was admittedly the leader of Vietnamese nationalism, he was also a Communist. He was beginning to receive aid from Communist China. Therefore, the French were able to convince us that containment of China meant support of French colonialism in Vietnam.

Vietnam 1946: France recognizes Ho Chi Minh

Despite the "ignoble betrayal" referred to by General MacArthur, Ho Chi Minh found it convenient to negotiate with French representative Jean Sainteny. As a result of the agreement entered into, in March 1946, France recognized the Republic of Vietnam as a "Free State" within the French Union, under Ho Chi Minh, with its capital at Hanoi.

In return, Ho Chi Minh agreed to the stationing of French troops in the north with the understanding they would be withdrawn by 1951. The French agreed to permit a referendum as to whether all of Vietnam

would become a unified, independent state within the French Union.

France abided by neither promise.

Troops were not withdrawn, nor were elections held. Instead, France took a step which was to insure 20 years of conflict—conflict which continues to this day.

On June 1, 1946, Admiral G. Thierry D'Argenlieu, the new French Viceroy in Indochina, established and recognized a puppet government in South Vietnam.

The Vietnamese desire for independence was frustrated a second time. Subsequent negotiations proved fruitless. So intense by now was the Vietnamese hatred for France that Ho Chi Minh, a Communist, was able to crystallize these emotions into a willingness by many Vietnamese—whether Communist or not—to fight against the French occupation forces for eight years, eventually to win.

Gradually, Ho Chi Minh's forces won control of most of Vietnam. French power shrunk to control of forts and the few large cities. To bolster their collapsing government in Vietnam, France appealed to the one-time Japanese puppet Bao Dai to again become head of state.

Negotiations were begun with Bao Dai in 1948, finally resulting in the "Elysee Agreements." As ratified by the French Parliament in January 1950, the Agreements—278 pages of tendentious legalisms—created three "autonomous" states, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. In these states, France retained control of foreign relations, armed forces, and, for all practical purposes, finances.

It was at this time, in January of 1950, that Ho Chi Minh sought and secured recognition from the Soviet Union and from Communist China.

On February 1, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson stated that the recognition by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China of Ho Chi Minh's government "should remove any illusions as to the 'Nationalist' nature of Ho Chi Minh's aims and reveals Ho in his true colors as the mortal enemy of native independence in Indo-China."

On February 7, both the United States and Britain recognized the Bao Dai Government.

In May of 1950, Mr. Acheson announced the U.S. would provide aid to restore "security" and "develop genuine nationalism" in Indochina.

With the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950, President Truman announced the "acceleration" of aid to Indochina.

It was argued in 1950 the decision by President Truman to assist the French in Indochina was a logical extension of the Truman Doctrine which evolved in the Mediterranean in 1947. Under that doctrine the United States had sent aid to Greece and Turkey when threatened with Communist aggression.

There were some basic differences between the Greek-Turkish situation and that found in Vietnam in 1950.

Greece was an independent nation with clearly established and defined borders, and an internationally recognized government. It was being attacked by Greek Communists who were based—and financed—from abroad. There was no popular internal revolution in process, no fight by the Greek people for freedom from foreign domination. The Greek government requested help. First Britain, then the U.S. responded with money, arms, and advisors.

Turkey was also a long-established nation with a recognized government whose borders were threatened by the Soviet Union. The government requested help and we responded with money, arms, and training advisors.

Vietnam was an altogether different situation. For the first time, we were officially committing American arms, money, military advisors to a colonial war on the side of colonial power.

The decision by President Truman was made in a peculiarly turbulent political climate. The fall of China had so charged the political atmosphere in Washington that the French appeal for assistance met readily receptive ears. The overt attack by the Communists in Korea, combined with the Communist recognition of Ho Chi Minh earlier in the year, seemed to justify even more the position adopted by the Truman Administration.

In August of 1950, the first American military advisors arrived in Vietnam—35 of them.

From this point, all opponents of the Bao Dai government were labeled Communists by the French. The tragic, unintended result of this war, as President Eisenhower noted in his book, "Mandate for Change, The White House Years":

"... had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader, rather than Chief of State, Bao Dai. . . ."

The Eisenhower inheritance

Aid received from Communist China beginning in 1950 had already enabled Ho Chi Minh's forces to capture one by one the entire French line of forts along the Chinese border. With the conclusion of the Korean War, Communist China was able to increase its aid to the Vietminh.

In 1953, President Eisenhower took office. He was forced to make basic decisions on Indochina almost at once. Most important was whether to continue assistance to the French, cut it back, or end it. President Eisenhower decided to continue and increase American aid, but to attempt to channel this aid around the French directly to Bao Dai and the Vietnamese people. He hoped to make Bao Dai more independent of France, more acceptable to the Vietnamese.

The French balked, insisting on keeping total control over all military and most economic aid. A relatively small program of direct aid to the Vietnamese continued, although it was resented by the French.

By 1954 our aid program had totaled over \$1 billion. As the French military collapse accelerated, we were underwriting a high percentage of the cost of their war.

Troubled spring

In January and February of 1954 a four power conference met to discuss the status of Berlin. Unable to resolve that question the representatives turned to other matters and agreed that a conference at Geneva would be convened in May to effect "a political settlement of the Korean question" and to discuss "the problem of restoring peace in Indochina." While not originally intended as a conference to settle boundaries in Indochina, but rather as a discussion of a cease fire, Ho Chi Minh's artillery was already at work writing a different conclusion. The saga of Dien Bien Phu had begun.

With the French military catastrophe at hand, President Eisenhower had to decide whether or not to intervene directly. The question of American intervention in Vietnam was put to the President on March 20, 1954, by the French Chief of Staff, General Paul Ely. He stated that only by massive American intervention could France hope to prevent a defeat at Dien Bien Phu. Without such intervention, it was intimated, France would be obliged to negotiate a settlement with the Vietminh.

In short, the general French thesis—supported by many Americans—seemed to be that if we did not intervene we would be handing the whole of Southeast Asia to the Communists.

A sharp argument arose within the Eisenhower Administration. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Arthur Radford, proposed a major United States military intervention from the sea beginning

with air strikes to support the French at Dien Bien Phu. General Matthew Ridgway opposed this.

Congressional leaders were consulted.

President Eisenhower gave serious consideration to such proposals. However, he also circulated our allies in Europe and elsewhere as to the advisability of and their willingness to join in such an intervention. He made clear that any intervention would have to be joint, not unilateral. Britain was the key, and refused, fearing it would scuttle the pending Geneva Conference and involve them in another endless colonial war.

Furthermore, France would not give satisfactory assurances, even at this late date, that it would grant independence to the peoples of Indochina.

In the end, President Eisenhower refused to permit a unilateral armed intervention to save a colonial regime.

He declared that he could not: "... conceive of a greater tragedy for America than to get heavily involved now in an all-out war in any of those regions (Indochina)."

The Eisenhower approach

Several facts are worth noting. President Eisenhower, the professional military man, permitted a full, free debate over our Vietnam policy among military chiefs. In effect, it was General Ridgway arguing against the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford.

He also listened to Members of Congress who objected to American intervention in Vietnam.

Even though we had expended enormous amounts of aid in support of the French in Vietnam, President Eisenhower was willing to cash in his chips in 1954, no matter how humiliating it might be to admit we had backed a loser, rather than throw good blood after bad money.

In other words, he realized the application of military power could not resolve a hopeless political situation in Vietnam.

President Eisenhower had listened to all the arguments and weighed them carefully. Regardless of which individual advanced what argument, the ultimate decision was the President's. It was not the arguments that preceded it, but the decision that counted.

The decision had the effect, as well, of cementing as an American position subscribed to by Republican and Democrat alike, at that time, that we should not become involved in another land war in Asia.

As a footnote to history, General Matthew B. Ridgway was to write in his memoirs:

"When the day comes for me to face my Maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing, the carrying out of some harebrained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of some thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened I would add the Indochina intervention."

The Geneva Conference

The Geneva Conference was not arranged to preside over the partition of Vietnam nor the withdrawal of France. Events at Dien Bien Phu—which fell on May 7, the day before the Vietnam phase of the Conference opened—dictated otherwise. The Conference did partition Vietnam and registered ultimate French withdrawal.

Participating in the Indochina phase were the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union, and after prolonged haggling, Communist China. These powers finally agreed that representatives of Cambodia and Laos take part along with a representative of Bao Dai and Ho Chi Minh.

The Conference was uniquely structured in that the five great powers were interested in an agreement on Indochina but were also interested in other problems and negotia-

tions of equal delicacy. Indeed they may have considered the latter of greater importance than peace in Indochina.

The key was the European Defense Community. The U.S. and Britain were attempting to found EDC and felt they could not over-pressure France on the Indochina question. The Soviet Union was equally interested in blocking EDC and pressured Ho Chi Minh to make concessions to France which Ho did not feel were justified. Since the Vietminh controlled three-quarters of all Vietnam, Ho was confident he could quickly capture the rest. He also felt it was but a matter of time before Laos also fell to Communist rule. Communist China, at the time, was trying to present a more moderate image to the world and was willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union in forcing Ho Chi Minh to ease his demands.

During the Conference France underwent a domestic crisis because of military reverses in Indochina and elected a new Premier, and thus a new set of negotiators. Even so, France emerged from the Conference having salvaged at the negotiating table much of which she had lost on the battlefield.

Ho Chi Minh agreed to pull Vietminh forces out of South Vietnam, which they largely controlled, back above the 17th parallel.

The Conference agreed to withdrawal of "regular troops," but did not press the issue of guerrillas. There was to be only routine replacement of troops and armament. Reinforcement and introduction of new weapons were prohibited. The population was to be allowed to move freely from one zone to another. A special "regroupment area" was created in Laos for the Communist Pathet Lao, composed of the northern provinces bordering on China and North Vietnam.

On the subject of reunification of North and South Vietnam the Conference made it clear the 17th parallel was not to be a permanent dividing line. It called for nationwide elections within two years, by July 1956. This last provision was assented to orally by all parties except the U.S. and Bao Dai.

The International Control Commission was to supervise observance of all provisions including elections. The Commission was composed of India (chairman), Poland and Canada.

Neither the U.S. nor South Vietnam signed the agreements. The U.S., in a separate statement, declared it would refrain from disturbing the agreements. The Vietminh probably were persuaded to accept the agreement because they felt confident that in two years the elections would sweep them into power.

Principal gain of the Vietminh was international recognition of their control over what has since become known as North Vietnam.

France—the government and French citizens—emerged from Geneva with Vietnam no longer a drain on resources and manpower, but with their commercial interests intact in South Vietnam. They profited vastly from the American investment, both economic and military, all through this decade. They still profit today.

The new South Vietnam

With Vietnam divided—at least temporarily—as a result of the Geneva Conference, the Eisenhower Administration was faced with yet another critical decision: whether to give aid to the government of South Vietnam.

During the Geneva Conference, Bao Dai had persuaded Ngo Dinh Diem to become premier of his government. Diem was strongly nationalist, anti-French and anti-Communist. He was, however, an unknown quantity, both in his homeland and internationally, as to his ability to govern; many considered him a mere caretaker until the 1956 elections when, they were confident, Ho Chi Minh would come back to power.

The events of the next 18 months read like a history of the Byzantine court. There were American officials—civil and military—who supported Diem, and Americans who thought him inadequate. There were French officials who actively conspired against him; others actively cooperated. Bao Dai—"governing" from Paris or the Riviera—alternately backed his premier, charged him with usurping his power, demanded his resignation, or ordered Viet troops to fight in his defense. Diem's army commander negotiated with the French, or disaffected Vietnamese, to overthrow him.

Diem had no administrative corps upon which to draw, the French were leaving and Vietnamese who had served under the French were not welcome. Great areas of South Vietnam were governed by nearly autonomous religious sects with their own armies. The Saigon police were a Mafia-like group of gangsters—also with their own militia.

Compounding the confusion in Saigon, a million refugees from the north fled Ho Chi Minh's Communist dictatorship and settled in South Vietnam. Diem had to provide housing, employment and food for the refugees and attempt to relocate them.

Ho Chi Minh used the two years 1954-56 to consolidate his power in North Vietnam. No longer leading a band of guerrillas, he took the course all newly-constituted Communist regimes have taken. Those who opposed his rule were killed. At least 50,000, perhaps as many as 100,000 were slaughtered. A peasant uprising were put down brutally. Small landowners—many of them with only a tiny fraction of an acre—were treated as though they were absentee landlords: they were shot.

In short, the millions who fled south were fleeing a reign of terror.

Diem: The successful years

Diem hung on. For the first time there was a Vietnam independent of both France and the Communists. A group of officials within the Eisenhower Administration argued that this fact alone merited American support and aid. Additionally, they argued, such aid could now go directly to the Vietnamese people, in line with the original Eisenhower goal.

Thus, when Diem formerly requested assistance from the United States—economic aid immediately to help care for the refugees as well as long-term aid programs—President Eisenhower agreed to help in a letter dated October 23, 1954.

That letter, so often trotted out by succeeding Administrations to prove that whatever they did was simply in line with the Eisenhower "legacy" deserves to be quoted:

"I am accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador . . . to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid is supplied.

"The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam, endowed with a strong Government. Such a Government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalistic aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad

and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

There are several points worth noting with respect to this offer of aid.

The most important is that a primary condition was attached, and reiterated in several different ways, to wit, that the new Government had to make the proper effort to survive on its own in order to receive economic and military assistance. This principle of "self-help" on the part of the recipient country had long been advocated by Republicans.

The letter was primarily "political" in its prescriptions, emphasizing the establishment of a "strong," "viable" government, and the effecting of needed reforms in the country. The military program was intended to establish a climate of security to make the former possible.

A month previous, in September 1954, the SEATO agreement and the Manila Pact had been agreed to by the U.S. and other nations, specifically giving the states of Indochina a guarantee against aggression from the outside and subversion from within.

This, plus the promise of aid, had the immediate effect of giving the Diem Government a combination of psychological, economic and military support necessary for it to survive.

Diem, thereafter, moved first against the gangsters around Saigon, and after defeating and dispersing them, disarmed and suppressed the autonomous religious sects. By October 1955, he felt strong enough to propose a referendum between the absent Bao Dai and himself. It was clear that Diem would have won overwhelmingly in any event, but his brother felt it necessary to manipulate the election giving Diem about 98 percent of the vote. This was the first indication that Diem's concept of a "viable" government was one in which authority was centralized in the person of the President.

The 1956 nonelection

The Geneva Agreements called for a national plebiscite in Vietnam by July 1956. That election was never held.

Diem knew that were the election to be held, it would be a popularity contest between himself and Ho Chi Minh; and he knew Ho would quite likely win. Ho was far better known as the leader in the fight against France. He had the aura of success about him. On a head-count basis there were simply more votes to be cast in the north than in South Vietnam. Further, Diem felt the International Control Commission could not supervise the election properly in the North and that Ho could as easily manipulate the polling there as Diem had in his own election in 1955. Finally, France, which had been commissioned at Geneva to help the ICC supervise the election in the south had pulled out completely, early in 1955, at Diem's insistence. The Geneva co-chairmen, Britain and Russia did not name a replacement for the French.

So, Diem decided against allowing the election.

He defended his action by saying neither his Government nor the United States had agreed at Geneva to the election and therefore were not bound by that agreement, and that France, which had agreed was gone. Technically, perhaps, he was correct. His decision foreshadowed a renewal of guerrilla activity a year later, in 1957, which became dangerously widespread and brutal in 1959-60.

Diem in decline

Diem, by 1957, had taken other actions which made the renewal of revolutionary guerrilla warfare both inevitable and successful.

He suppressed all political opposition in the south, and not just the Viet Cong, but those who attempted to criticize him through the regular channels of parliament and press.

His administration drew to a large extent from the Catholic refugees from the north, causing the beginnings of friction with the largely Buddhist population of the south.

Throughout history Vietnam's thousands of villages were traditionally governed by village chiefs or headmen. These village leaders had their family roots deep in the local soil, many having lived in the same village for centuries. Diem chose to replace many of these village headmen with appointees of his own from Saigon, causing deep resentment among the villagers so governed.

This resentment made it easier for the Viet Cong to draw much of its early support from non-Communist South Vietnamese. Many of the revolutionists in the South were not necessarily Communist to begin with, but rather anti-Saigon or anti-Diem.

The Eisenhower Administration has been criticized for not pushing Diem harder on political "reforms." What is really meant is that Diem allowed the power structure he had so carefully put together in 1954-55 to disintegrate. To talk of superimposing western democratic institutions overnight on the Vietnamese culture is pointless. There exists no truly democratic nation from Burma to the gates of China in all of Southeast Asia.

A candid statement as to Diem's disintegrating regime, however, should not obscure one important point.

President Eisenhower stuck to his basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was political and not military, insofar as the U.S. was concerned. That fundamental precept was not to be altered until 1961 when the new Administration of President John F. Kennedy took office.

Thus, the Republican position could be summarized:

- (1) No American armies in Asia, no land war in Asia;
- (2) No commitment to aid colonialism or to suppress nationalism in Asia;
- (3) In any event, no unilateral military intervention; a resort to force only under some international sanction, in particular the U.N.;
- (4) Any multilateral commitment to force should be in a specific area, for a specific, limited purpose in order to keep the conflict localized;
- (5) Specifically in South Vietnam, the supplying of aid—money, supplies, arms—but not U.S. armies.

PART II—YEARS OF FAILURE

The Kennedy administration

In 1961 President Kennedy had most of the same options President Eisenhower had in 1953; he could continue economic and military aid with the same emphasis on a political solution; he could increase aid, cut it, or phase it out. The choice was his.

We tend to forget the political climate of the time. The tone of the new Administration was one of disdain for the performance of Eisenhower, particularly in the field of foreign affairs. There was a tendency in the Kennedy Administration to believe that everything could be fixed if the proper American was sent there to fix it.

On April 30, in Vietnam, a group of 18 South Vietnamese leaders who had fought against the French signed an open letter to Diem demanding economic, administrative and military reforms. By November 11, anti-Diem feeling was so intense a military coup by elite paratroop battalions was attempted against the Diem regime. It failed.

One month later, in December 1960, the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam (NLF) was formed by militant South Vietnamese insurgents—mostly Communists. Their platform was a renewal of open, armed warfare against the Saigon government, following 3 years of terror and assassination.

In dealing with the NLF, successive Democratic Administrations have assumed since 1961 that the revival of the war in the South

was undertaken solely at Hanoi's initiative. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says the war in the south "could end literally in 24 hours" if Hanoi so decided.

U.S. State Department assumptions that (1) South Vietnamese Communists are totally controlled by Hanoi, and (2) there is absolutely no difference between the ambitions of the two, are open to question.

It should be noted that the NLF has been southern oriented. Forty of their senior leaders were native South Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese Communists have, in the past, found Hanoi quite willing to enter into agreements at the expense of the South Vietnamese where Communist or not. Examples:

One, on March 6, 1946, Ho Chi Minh entered into an agreement with the French which provided for a "free state" embracing what is now North Vietnam, but leaving southern Vietnam under French control.

Two, a second agreement on September 14, 1946, further confirmed Paris rule over the South Vietnamese.

Three, the Geneva Agreements of July 1954, left the south under control of the Diem government for at least 2 more years—this when most of the south was already under Communist control.

Four, thereafter, neither Hanoi nor Peking, nor Moscow made strong representations against dropping elections in 1956, in effect confirming Diem's control and leaving the South Vietnamese Communists out in the cold.

All of which is a reminder to the South Vietnamese Communists that North Vietnam has separate interests, and has not in the past been the most reliable of allies.

On January 29, 1961, Hanoi Radio recognized the NLF, praised it and shortly thereafter infiltration from North Vietnam into the south was stepped up. Terrorism was on the rise; assassinations of South Vietnamese increased; attacks on Diem military forces rose in number and ferocity.

President Kennedy, concerned with this increased Communist activity, told a news conference on May 5, 1961, use of American forces in South Vietnam was under consideration.

Thereafter, American counter-insurgency forces were moved into South Vietnam; President Kennedy reverted to old fashioned gunboat diplomacy and sent an aircraft carrier to demonstrate off Haiphong; troops were sent into Thailand and then withdrawn to show our strength and readiness to move.

From the vantage point of 1967 these maneuvers seem to have the thrust and feint of shadow boxing, but they were military actions and made more fateful military actions which were to follow much easier.

The parade to Saigon

In 1961, too, began a parade of political, diplomatic and military figures from Washington to Saigon. May 11, six days after the President's press conference, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was dispatched to Southeast Asia. Warmed by a cordial, two-day session, Mr. Johnson likened President Diem to George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill.

In a joint statement at Saigon, May 13, Diem and Mr. Johnson said:

"The United States recognizes that the President of Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, who was recently reelected to office by an overwhelming majority of his countrymen despite bitter Communist opposition, is in the vanguard of those leaders who stand for freedom on the periphery of the Communist empire in Asia."

On returning from Southeast Asia, Vice President Johnson wrote a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961:

"The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion

now in Southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with the further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision."

Close upon the Vice President's heels, Professor Eugene Staley of Stanford University visited Saigon for the Administration. He was commissioned to direct an all-embracing study which was to form the basis for a new program of American aid.

Staley strategic hamlets

Staley prescribed large increases in the Vietnamese army, the Civil Guard and village militia, together with an increased flow of arms and radio communications equipment. Most of this equipment which went to the villages was later acquired by the Viet Cong.

The Staley plan also called for creation of the Strategic Hamlet, whereby scattered villagers would be brought together in compounds better to protect them from marauding Viet Cong. It was based on the successful British tactic in Malaya.

There were, however, basic differences between the British situation in Malaya a decade earlier and that found in Vietnam in 1961.

First, with the cooperation of the Thailand government, the British were able to seal the border and therefore deny the Communists in Malaya any overland supply routes.

Second, the Communist foe were largely Chinese aliens, squatters, and therefore readily identifiable.

Third, the native Malayan people were willing to cooperate because of the hostility with which they regarded these Chinese aliens. At most in Malaya the hard-core Communist terrorists numbered no more than 8,000 and the total Chinese population something over 400,000.

Fourth, the French had already tried it during their war in Vietnam and failed.

In Vietnam there could be no sealing off of the Laotian border which was controlled by Communists. Infiltration and cross-border movement were easy for the guerrillas. In Vietnam, the Communist guerrillas were indigenous and could not be distinguished from non-Communist villagers. In Vietnam the villagers had lived on the same land for generations. They objected vehemently to being moved from their villages into what could too often be described as concentration camps. Finally, in Vietnam the guerrillas totaled between 15,000 and 20,000 armed men in 1961 and by 1962 this figure had grown to 30,000.

Yet, President Kennedy approved the program. On September 17, 1961, R. G. K. Thompson, former permanent Defense Secretary in Malaya, was brought to Vietnam to put the Staley plan into action.

The Taylor-Rostow mission

On October 11, 1961, President Kennedy announced he was sending his military advisor, General Maxwell Taylor, and Economist Walt W. Rostow, then the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs, to South Vietnam. Their mission, charged the President was to find out "whether Vietnamese nationalism had turned irrevocably against us or still might serve as a basis for the fight against Communism."

It is generally agreed that the Taylor report contained not simply recommendations to beef up and improve military operations, but made a strong case for sweeping political reforms in the Diem government, including increased freedom of speech, some form of

decentralization, and the release from jail of bona fide nationalist leaders.

Unfortunately, General Taylor's report was severely denounced by the government-controlled Saigon press for what it termed an attempt to infringe on South Vietnamese sovereignty. On November 24, 1961, the newspaper *Thoi-Bao* ran an eight-column headline: "Republic of Vietnam No Guinea Pig For Capitalist Imperialism—Is It Not Time to Revise Vietnamese-American Collaboration?" The accompanying article, echoed by other Saigon newspapers, contained accusations of American "interference" with internal affairs of South Vietnam, aimed at "gaining profits under the exploitation policy of capitalist imperialism." The Diem government refused to be swayed by broad diplomatic hints that we might recall our Ambassador if reforms were not effected.

The result was a joint American-Vietnamese eleven-point declaration of January 1962, which was clearly a compromise in favor of Saigon. The political reforms urged by Taylor were watered down, but military and economic support were increased.

The qualitative shift

The war in Vietnam—and American involvement—had taken a qualitative shift. By the end of 1961, it became apparent that the Kennedy Administration had opted for military intervention.

Arthur Schlesinger admits that Mr. Kennedy's decision at the end of 1961 "was to place the main emphasis on the military effort."

The first American soldier was killed in open combat in 1961.

Perhaps the most succinct account of President Kennedy's decision to escalate the Vietnam conflict is that of his Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Robert Manning, who wrote in April 1967:

"One day late in 1961, President Kennedy discussed with his counselors a decision to increase the American 'presence' in South Vietnam from a few hundred 'military advisers' to a military force of 15,000 men. Undersecretary of State George Ball opposed this, arguing that it would seriously alter the character of the war and might eventually suck more than 300,000 American men into action there. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara agreed that Ball's reservations were fair ones, but they were willing to risk the consequences. Kennedy decided that he was too."

"Hindsight marks that decision as a critical step in this country's creeping escalation toward international tragedy and a domestic crisis of politics and morality. Yet in the news reports of the day it was characterized only as a 'modest' increase in American advisory help to the beleaguered South Vietnamese government."

"What if news reporters had been told of the full discussion? They would have reported that the United States had decided to increase its commitment to 15,000 men, that this might lead to the involvement of as many as 300,000 soldiers—then unthinkable—and that the President's advisers disagreed about taking such a step. If the newsmen had told that story, how would the American public have reacted? Would the course of history have been changed?"

NOTE.—The historian searching for a motive in President Kennedy's decision to opt for a military solution in Vietnam finds two separate accounts. The first is that of James Reston, *New York Times* editor: "A few minutes after this meeting (with Khrushchev in Vienna in June 1961) President Kennedy told me that apparently Khrushchev had decided that 'anybody stupid enough to get involved in that situation (the Bay of Pigs) was immature, and anybody who didn't see it thru was timid and, therefore, could be bullied.'" Mr. Reston says, President Kennedy then put 12,000

American soldiers into Vietnam as an offset to Khrushchev's estimate of him, altho he was amply warned that he was creating an unlimited commitment and was violating all his pronouncements about not allowing the United States to get into an Asian land war. (*Washington Daily News*, June 2, 1966). The second account is found in "Facing the Brink" by Edward Weintal and Charles Bartlett. "Had he not suffered reverses in the Bay of Pigs and Laos," they write, "it may well be that President Kennedy would have thought twice before expanding the Viet Nam commitment early in 1962 from 700 to 11,000 advisers. Had he followed a long-range policy plan rather than an understandable concern for his image as a result of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, he might have reduced rather than increased the Viet Nam commitment."

The two principal historians of the Kennedy Administration, Theodore Sorensen and Schlesinger, both plead that past American policy gave Mr. Kennedy virtually no alternative. Schlesinger wrote that President Kennedy, "had no choice now but to work within the situation he had inherited," and Dulles' policy in South Vietnam had "left us in 1961 no alternative but to continue the effort of 1954." Sorensen agreed.

Accepting this thesis at face value—that an entire Democratic Administration was bereft of alternatives—pictures President Kennedy as a mere robot with no responsibility for whatever actions he took in Vietnam. Carried to its ultimate absurdity this thesis presents Lyndon Johnson as a captive of George Washington's policies, with no real justification for quadrennial Presidential elections.

United States again backs Diem

By February 7, 1962, the total of U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam had increased to 4,000. Three weeks later, two fighter planes piloted by members of the South Vietnam Air Force, bombed and strafed President Diem's Saigon palace. Diem's relations with American newsmen were deteriorating as correspondents for U.S. papers and networks were booted out of South Vietnam with increasing frequency. Yet the Kennedy Administration, by the beginning of March 1962, was attempting to rally public opinion behind Diem. *Time* described it this way on February 23, 1962:

"Whatever the difficulties, the U.S. is sticking with Diem. Speaking last week to Rotarians in Saigon, U.S. Ambassador Frederick Nolting Jr. urged critics of Diem to be boosters instead of naysayers. 'The divisions among patriotic, anti-Communist Vietnamese, which are no secret to anyone here,' said Nolting, 'are in my judgment a great barrier to your country's progress and a real danger to your country's survival.' Conceding that Diem was taking his own sweet time in instituting reforms, Nolting said that he agreed 'to a certain extent' with those Vietnamese who complain that 'the real benefits of a free society are not getting through to the people.' But he also praised Diem's 'dedicated and courageous leadership,' added that reforms 'could be accomplished relatively quickly if only more people were willing to work and sacrifice to accomplish them.'"

Washington soon after, according to *The New York Times*, instructed the American Mission in Saigon "to get along with President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime come hell or high water and forget about political reforms."

Lest the scale be tipped too far against Diem, it must be remembered the fabric of his regime was further weakened by acts of Communist terrorists. During 1962, an estimated 1,700 South Vietnamese civilians were assassinated by the Viet Cong, frequently with unimaginable barbarism, and 9,688 were kidnapped. Their targets were not just Diem's unpopular village administrators but school teachers, and those engaged in agriculture

and social reform; literally irreplaceable citizens of South Vietnam.

Peking proposal

On March 1, 1962, Secretary Rusk commented on the request by Peking of February 24, 1962 that the co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference, and other countries concerned, consult regarding Vietnam.

Said Rusk, "... the United States is always prepared to talk about situations which represent a threat to the peace, but what must be talked about is the root of the trouble; in this case it is the Communist aggression against Vietnam in disregard of the Geneva Accords."

No talks were held.

The ICC report

On June 2, 1962, the Canadian and Indian members of the International Control Commission in Vietnam created by the 1954 Geneva Accords issued a report (which Poland refused to sign) charging North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the United States with factual violations of the Geneva Accord.

Thereafter, the Commission issued no more reports until 1965.

U.S. Marines in Thailand

In 1961, The Three Princes War resumed in Laos. The U.S. had withdrawn its chips from the middle or "Neutral" Prince, and placed them on the "Rightist" Prince. His Royal Laotian Army suffered serious defections and reverses in 1962, and was driven by the Neutralist forces and Pathet Lao Communist forces across the Mekong River into Thailand. On May 15, 1962, at the request of Thailand, President Kennedy dispatched a force of 5,000 U.S. Marines into northern Thailand. On July 30, 1962, the Marines were withdrawn. Their effect on the outcome of the Geneva Conference on Laos was, at best, problematical.

The Conference convened in 1961, and finally achieved agreement in 1962. The agreement was billed by the Kennedy Administration as neutralizing all of Laos. Actually it left untouched the Pathet Lao control of the Laotian territory bordering on Vietnam, through which North Vietnamese have been infiltrating to South Vietnam and supplying the Viet Cong.

About this time, in 1962, comforting analyses of the Vietnam conflict by two of the most prominent U.S. State Department officials were offered for public consumption, one as to the inferiority of the enemy and the other as to the limited nature of our commitment.

Said Under Secretary of State George W. Ball:

"The guerrillas whom the Vietnamese Army is fighting are under distinct handicaps. In many cases they are poorly trained and equipped and not motivated by deep conviction. Rather, they are merely unsophisticated villagers or peasants who have been conscripted by terror or treachery. In such a case they are likely to have had only rudimentary training in weapons-handling and tactics. Their equipment may be makeshift, often just what they can capture or fabricate themselves.

"Only the leaders and the hard core have a strong ideological commitment. The rank and file are their puppets—those whom they have bought, coerced, or intimidated."

And Mr. Kennedy's roving ambassador Averell Harriman, in explaining why we could afford a military commitment in Vietnam but not Laos, said:

"In Vietnam, on the other hand," he said in 1962, "a decision to assist the Republic of Vietnam to defend itself against the sort of attack being waged in that country would not involve the deployment of U.S. combat forces and would not require the occupation of foreign territory by the United States or other Western forces."

Political developments in South Vietnam

On June 26, 1962, South Vietnam's National Assembly extended its own term of office by one year. And when on October 26, the Assembly extended Diem's emergency powers to rule by decree for another year, it was an act of near prophecy, for Diem was assassinated precisely one year and seven days thereafter.

In considering the politics of the Diem regime, it must be kept in mind that in Vietnam, as in most Asiatic countries, no tradition of formal representative government exists.

The Vietnam nationalist parties that formed during French rule were secret movements accustomed to operating clandestinely and often warring with each other. This tradition of secretiveness, of factionalism, of small, select groups composed of men who could be trusted implicitly, continues today.

Diem accomplished a miracle in putting together a stable government, and attracting support of many key factions of the elite in South Vietnam. If there is one point most observers agree on, it is that from 1958 onward Diem seemed to draw inward, losing touch with the coalition he had put together.

More and more, he appeared to rely on the advice of his immediate family and few others. Personal government, not new to Vietnam, was carried to an extreme.

Thus, when crack paratroop battalions surrounded his palace in 1960 and demanded reforms, their leaders were not thinking in terms of Western democracy; rather, they sought an end to deliberate use of the personal power of members of the Diem family to monitor the loyalty of civil and military officials, to control both the formulation and execution of policy, to determine who should be promoted in the civil and military bureaucracies, and to manipulate the military in such a way as to interfere with successful prosecution of the conflict with the Viet Cong.

While Communist pressure increased, Diem and his family devoted increasing attention to sumptuary legislation to improve Saigon morals. As an example of the state to which the National Assembly had been reduced, Madame Nhu—Diem's sister-in-law—was able to dictate legislation prohibiting men and women from dancing with each other. . . .

Meanwhile, Viet Cong victories multiplied. On January 2, 1963, a force of 200 Viet Cong attacked and defeated a demoralized force of 2,000 South Vietnam regulars in the Mekong Delta. Five helicopters were shot down, killing three Americans.

By spring, military action was overshadowed by a series of tragic political events; yet Kennedy Administration pronouncements remained highly optimistic.

In 1962 Defense Secretary McNamara had said, "Every quantitative measurement we have shows we're winning this war."

On March 8, 1963, Secretary Rusk said the struggle against the Viet Cong was "turning an important corner" and concluded Diem's forces "clearly have the initiative in most areas of the country."

The fall of Diem

Of the near-million North Vietnamese who fled southward in 1954–55, roughly 90 percent were Catholic. It was among these people that Diem found many of his most loyal administrators. South Vietnam, predominantly non-Christian, found these refugees doubly alien. They were from the north; they were adherents of a Western religion. Whatever favoritism was shown northern Catholics by the Diem regime—and there is some evidence of such favoritism—created frictions and jealousies on the part of the leaders of the Buddhist majority.

On May 8, 1963, in the city of Hue, government troops fired into a crowd protesting Diem's strictures against flying the Buddhist flag during a religious festival.

Demonstrations spread to Saigon. On June

11, a monk committed suicide by setting fire to himself, to be followed in the next six months by six other acts of self-immolation.

On August 21, Diem's Special Forces attacked Buddhist pagodas in Saigon, Hue, and other cities, arresting a number of Buddhists.

Diem's Buddhist Foreign Secretary, Vu Van Mau, resigned in protest. Mme. Nhu's father, the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, also resigned along with most of his staff.

Students joined the Buddhist demonstrations. Diem closed the Universities in Saigon and Hue, and all secondary schools in Saigon. About 4,000 students were arrested.

Not all opposition to Diem, his brother Nhu, and his sister-in-law, Mme. Nhu, arose from Buddhist leaders. Discontent in key segments of South Vietnam's rickety power structure was being transformed into rebellion.

Still, on July 11, 1963, Ambassador Nolting returned to Saigon from Washington with assurances of continued U.S. support of the government of President Diem. He called for "unity of purpose" and warned against "internal dissension."

Newspaper accounts describing the deteriorating situation in Vietnam had long been labeled propaganda by Administration spokesmen. By the end of summer the Kennedy Administration could no longer maintain the credence of the American people that Diem was popular with his own people and was winning the war. On September 2, 1963, in a CBS interview President Kennedy admitted Diem's regime had "gotten out of touch with the people" and that he believed it could regain support only if there were "changes in policy and perhaps with personnel."

On September 21, Secretary McNamara and General Taylor once again flew to Saigon. While they were there elections were held for the National Assembly. All candidates were approved in advance by the Diem Government. Obviously, so far, no change in policy or personnel had taken place.

On October 2, 1963, the White House issued a summary of the McNamara-Taylor report on their findings. The summary makes interesting reading:

"Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Vietnam are capable of suppressing it. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

Added General Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, in the November 1, 1963 service newspaper *Stars and Stripes*:

"Victory in the sense it would apply to this kind of war is just months away and the reduction of American advisors can begin any time now."

As *Stars and Stripes* was being delivered to the newstands that November 1, a military junta led by General Duong Van Minh, overthrew the Diem Government and seized control of Saigon. The next day, November 2, Diem and his brother Nhu were assassinated.

Despite all the clamor, rioting, and discontent among civilians, in the end it was the South Vietnamese military—the group over which the U.S. had the greatest degree of direct control—which was to overthrow and assassinate Diem.

Political chaos was immediate in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, on November 15, a U.S. mili-

tary spokesman carried on the McNamara-Taylor-Harkins line and promised 1,000 American military men would be withdrawn from Vietnam beginning on December 3.

On November 22, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated and a new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, took office.

Lyndon Johnson takes command

Once again a new American President had an opportunity to reassess the situation and the American position in Vietnam:

President Johnson could deal with an altogether new government in Saigon; he was not obliged to deal with the Diem family.

The NLF and Viet Cong controlled much of South Vietnam. By June of 1963, the NLF was able to levy taxes in 41 of South Vietnam's 44 provinces.

The NLF had already (reported by Radio Hanoi November 17, 1963) made a six-point peace statement, couched in violent accusatory language.

There were still fewer than 20,000 American troops committed to Vietnam.

According to *The New York Times*, UN Secretary General U Thant met with President Johnson shortly after President Kennedy's assassination and conveyed to him an offer from Ho Chi Minh proposing talks on a settlement.

He still had before him the DeGaulle offer of August 29, 1963, rejected by the Kennedy Administration, to help work for an independent but neutral South Vietnam.

In December 1963, Cambodian Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk again invited South Vietnam to join his country in a neutral confederation.

While President Johnson had options to choose from, President Kennedy did not leave him the same alternatives which President Eisenhower left in 1961. Actions of the Kennedy Administration had decidedly narrowed the field. The American commitment was greater; Americans were actually involved in combat; more and more, American military prestige was at stake.

In addition, President Johnson from all accounts was concerned with maintaining the appearance of continuity in both domestic and foreign policy.

In December 1963, President Johnson made his choice and announced it through his New Year's message to General Minh of South Vietnam. The message read in part:

"The United States will continue to furnish you and your people with the fullest measure of support in this bitter fight. We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and materials as needed to assist you in achieving victory.

"Our aims are, I know, identical with yours: to enable your government to protect its people from the acts of terror perpetrated by Communist insurgents from the north. As the forces of your government become increasingly capable of dealing with this aggression, American military personnel in South Vietnam can be progressively withdrawn.

"The United States Government shares the view of your government that 'neutralization' of South Vietnam is unacceptable. As long as the Communist regime in North Vietnam persists in its aggressive policy, neutralization of South Vietnam would only be another name for a Communist takeover. Peace will return to your country just as soon as the authorities in Hanoi cease and desist from their terrorist aggression.

"I know from my own experience in Vietnam how warmly the Vietnamese people respond to a direct human approach and how they have hungered for this in their leaders. So again I pledge the energetic support of my country to your government and your people."

Thus President Johnson publicly revealed his belief that American involvement in

Vietnam required an open-end military commitment.

The President now set the goal as military victory.

At a time when President Johnson was making his decision for deeper American involvement in Vietnam, the opportunity existed to make that involvement worthwhile by insisting on a sound civilian government in Saigon capable of leading the people. Yet, he allowed the military junta to continue its total dominance of the civilian government. The generals neither knew how to govern, nor showed any real desire to learn. The Administration, meanwhile, shipped in more money, more guns, and more American troops.

In the 18 months that followed ten governments passed through Saigon in quick succession, each more disorganized than the last.

The Johnson Administration was to express high hopes for each of these ten regimes. General Khanh, for instance—who replaced General Minh in January 1964—was described by McNamara as "an able and energetic leader," who has "demonstrated his grasp of the basic elements—political, economic and psychological, as well as military—required to defeat the Viet Cong." Etc., etc.

Khanh bounced in and out of the premiership for a year after the McNamara speech, finally was packed off as roving Ambassador to the world.

Despite this political chaos, when McNamara testified before Congress on February 18, 1964, he still insisted the "bulk" of U.S. troops would be pulled out by the end of 1965.

By July 1964, when General William C. Westmoreland succeeded to the command of the U.S. military advisory mission, our advisory body had grown to about 23,000, but the South Vietnamese whom they came to advise were melting away. During the winter of 1964-65 the South Vietnamese Army had dwindled to slightly over 200,000 men. They had lost by desertion, or to the Communists, a good third of their strength.

Not only was South Vietnam suffering from massive desertions from its army, but shortly after Diem's death it was discovered Staley's Strategic Hamlet Program was a crushing failure. The U.S. Mission found thousands of supposedly "secure" hamlets were really controlled secretly by the Viet Cong, who often used them for supply and rest havens. The United States had contributed tens of millions of dollars worth of equipment, including cement, radios, weapons, fertilizer and livestock.

When the Minh junta came into power Premier Tho stated that only 20 percent of the 8,600 Strategic Hamlets the Diem government claimed to have built could in any way be regarded as usable.

The succeeding military governments and juntas did little to remedy this situation. The key to real security for the South Vietnamese peasant lay not so much in barbed wire but in the type of political leadership that would attract his loyalty and make the struggle against the Viet Cong seem worth the risk.

On March 26, 1964, Secretary McNamara admitted: "But the large indigenous support that the Viet Cong receives means that solutions must be as much political and economic as military. Indeed, there can be no such thing as a purely 'military' solution to the war in South Vietnam."

The presidential election

At this point in history conduct of the affairs of Vietnam was once again influenced by political events elsewhere—the United States was involved in a presidential election campaign.

Through the summer of 1964, the Vietnam situation—both political and military—was deteriorating. Day-to-day conduct of the war remained the responsibility of Kennedy ap-

pointees who stayed with the Johnson Administration. Rusk, McNamara, Bundy, Rostow, Taylor, were left to handle Vietnam while President Johnson electioneered.

The first indication of a theme that was to be struck repeatedly during the coming campaign was introduced during a television interview on March 15, 1964, when the President told the listening audience:

"I was reading a letter only today that General Eisenhower wrote the late President Diem 10 years ago, and it is a letter that I could have well written to President Khanh and sent out by Mr. McNamara."

One of the most trying aspects of living with Mr. Johnson's conduct of foreign affairs is precisely this gambit which might be termed Diplomatic Darwinism. By this is meant the President's insistence that whatever he may be doing is but part of a steady evolution from commitments made by earlier Presidents, particularly President Eisenhower.

Thus, he was to reiterate during the presidential campaign that his several decisions by which we became engaged in a full-scale shooting war in Vietnam were merely logical implementations of that far away and long ago 1954 Eisenhower letter agreeing to limited aid for South Vietnam—money, supplies and arms, but not combat troops.

Gulf of Tonkin resolution

A second justification, equalling the by-now tattered 1954 letter in usefulness, was the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of August 7, 1964. The series of events leading to the resolution began with a July 30 South Vietnamese naval raid on North Vietnamese island radar and naval installations. According to official accounts, the U.S. Seventh Fleet was not informed of the raid. On August 2, a U.S. destroyer on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin near the islands was attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats. The PT boats were driven off with gunfire and an air attack. The U.S. formally protested to Hanoi.

On August 4, two U.S. destroyers reported a second attack by North Vietnamese PT boats. President Johnson ordered U.S. "air action" against "gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Vietnam."

On August 5, President Johnson requested Congress to enact a joint resolution "to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia."

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) questioned the wisdom of such unilateral action on the part of the United States as provided for by this resolution. During consideration of the resolution he raised the same issue President Eisenhower had raised 10 years earlier when, in 1954, the French requested American assistance at Dien Bien Phu. In 1954, Mr. Eisenhower surveyed our allies as to their willingness to join in taking such a step. Asked Senator Javits of Senator Fulbright in 1964:

"What I wish to know from the Senator is, first: Have we consulted with our allies? Second, what are we to look to from our allies in the way of assistance, aid, comfort, partnership, and the future implementation of the resolution? It is one thing to stand alone; it is another thing to stand with seven other countries, three of them in the area, implementing a solemn commitment, which is just as binding on them as it is on us."

Scope of the resolution

The joint resolution was in three parts. The first expressed Congressional approval of the President's action to repel attacks on U.S. forces, and the third part extended the life of the resolution until the President should determine that peace had been restored or until terminated by concurrent resolution of Congress. These two sections were not challenged in the Senate debate.

Section 2 was the center of discussion. It reads:

"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense for its freedom."

The potential effect of agreeing to this section was of concern to many Senators. During the Senate debate, Senator Daniel Brewster (D., Md.) asked:

"So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize, or recommend, or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China?"

Replied Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.) floor manager of the resolution and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. . . . Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia; that our power is sea and air. . . ."

The reply did not satisfy the Senate. Senator John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.) went more directly to the heart of the issue. He engaged Senator Fulbright in a lengthy colloquy, part of which follows:

"Mr. COOPER. The second section of the resolution goes, as the Senator said, to steps the President might take concerning the parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the countries under the protocol—which are, of course, Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. The Senator will remember that the SEATO Treaty, in article IV, provides that in the event an armed attack is made upon a party to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or upon one of the protocol states such as South Vietnam, the parties to the treaty, one of whom is the United States, would then take such action as might be appropriate, after resorting to their constitutional processes. I assume that would mean, in the case of the United States, that Congress would be asked to grant the authority to act.

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.

"Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?"

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it. . . ."

"Mr. COOPER. I ask these questions because it is well for the country and all of us to know what is being undertaken. . . ."

"Under section 2, are we now providing the President, if he determines it necessary, the authority to attack cities and ports in North Vietnam, not primarily to prevent an attack upon our forces but, as he might see fit, to prevent any further aggression against South Vietnam?"

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the reasons for the procedure provided in this joint resolution, and also in the Formosa and Middle East instances is in response, let us say, to the new developments in the field of warfare.

"Under modern conditions of warfare . . . it is necessary to anticipate what may occur. Things move so rapidly that this is the way in which we must respond to the new developments. That is why this provision is neces-

sary or important. Does the Senator agree with me that this is so?"

"Mr. COOPER. Yes, warfare today is different. Time is of the essence. But the power provided the President in section 2 is great.

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that.

"Mr. COOPER. I understand, and believe that the President will use this vast power with judgment.

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. He intends to do it, and he has done it. . . ."

"I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

"Mr. COOPER. I know it is understood and agreed that in the defense of our own ships and forces any action we might take to repel attacks could lead to war, if the Vietnamese or the Chinese Communists continued to engage in attacks against our forces. I hope they will be deterred by the prompt action of the President.

"We accept this first duty of security and honor. But I would feel untrue to my own convictions if I did not say that a different situation obtains with respect to South Vietnam. I know that a progression of events for 10 years has carried us to this crisis. Ten years have passed and perhaps the events are inevitable now, no one can tell. But as long as there is hope and the possibility of avoiding with honor a war in southeast Asia—a conflagration which, I must say, could lead into war with Communist China, and perhaps to a third world war with consequences one can scarcely contemplate today—I hope the President will use his power wisely with respect to our commitments in South Vietnam, and that he will use all other honorable means which may be available, such as consultations in the United Nations, and even with the Geneva powers.

"We have confidence in the President and in his good judgment. But I believe we have the obligation of understanding fully that there is a distinction between defending our own forces, and taking offensive measures in South Vietnam which could lead progressively to a third world war."

(Emphasis added.)

Perhaps the most often repeated statement during debate on the resolution was that the United States should not get bogged down in a land war in Asia. There were equally as many assurances that this was not contemplated.

Yet it was made quite clear that Section 2 of the resolution did in fact authorize the President to send land armies into Vietnam and also to bomb North Vietnam.

Certainly, from their colloquy, both Senator Cooper and Senator Fulbright were firm in their own minds that the resolution did authorize whatever actions the President might see fit to take. If this is the correct interpretation, then it would appear the President is on firm ground when he states—as he has so often since stated—that later commitments of U.S. ground forces to combat as well as the bombings of North Vietnam were authorized by Congress.

Congress drew some assurance from its assumption in 1964 that such a contingency was remote and that the President, being a man of "good judgment," would not act rashly, would use his power cautiously, would always consult Congress as well as the U.N. and the Geneva powers.

The President was to give Congress ample ground for this belief during 1964. During the entire presidential election campaign he repeatedly assured the American people he was not in office to engage in such a massive land war or to take rash actions.

During the debate on the resolution, Senator Thruston B. Morton summarized the feelings of many Republicans in Congress when he said, "I believe Congress should speak loud and clear and make it plain to any would-be aggressor that we intend to stand here. If we make that clear we will avoid war, and not have to land vast armies on the shores of Asia." The President found the resolution spoke loudly enough and clearly enough so that he signed it on August 11.

But this was an election year. And the very next day, August 12, the President was to dull the sound and blur the clarity of the resolution—and his own intentions—with a campaign speech to the Bar Association in New York. He spoke sorrowfully of those who were "eager to enlarge the conflict" and then he added:

"They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover such action would offer no solution at all to the real problem of Vietnam."

This thesis, that American boys were not to be sent half-way around the world to do the job Asian boys should be doing, was repeated in an Akron, Ohio, speech October 21.

This was the President's campaign reassurance to the American people; it may also have contributed to the Communist miscalculation as to American intentions in Vietnam.

Election year—Bargain budgets

Reinforcing Congress' belief that the U.S. commitment in Vietnam would be limited, new obligatory authority sought for defense had dropped from \$48.1 billion in fiscal 1963, to \$47.2 billion in fiscal 1964.

A further decline had been registered in fiscal 1965 when defense N. O. A. (requested in January 1964) amounted to only \$46.8 billion. In short, the election year defense requests did not reflect the realities of fighting then going on.

By March 1964, newspaper accounts described Vietnamese reluctance to take U.S. military advice and described the difficulties we were facing in getting Vietnamese troops to fight. On April 25, the AP reported that in the first four and a half months of 1964, 324 American servicemen had become battle casualties.

Beginning in May, with American forces already in combat, reports of serious shortages were verified making necessary the use of dangerously obsolete equipment.

On May 15, Rep. Carl Vinson, then Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced he would call Secretary McNamara for a closed session in regard to a full-scale investigation of the use of obsolete military equipment in Vietnam.

The distressing series of events led Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen on May 27 to declare, "While the Johnson Administration falters in indecision, the United States is a party to another treadmill conflict. . . ."

By July 1964 the war was costing the United States \$1.5 million a day. Announced troop strength in Vietnam had climbed to 18,000.

The Administration found it necessary to request a \$700 million defense supplemental appropriation specifically for the war in Vietnam, the first in a chain of afterthought supplementals to follow.

Yet total U.S. troop strength levels consistently failed to reflect the escalation of conflict in Vietnam. On June 30, 1962, total active duty military personnel numbered 2,807,819.

On June 30, 1963, troop strength was down to 2,699,677 and the next year, on June 30, 1964, down a third time to 2,687,409.

By June 30, 1965, after five years of steadily

increasing U.S. commitment in Vietnam, total active duty U.S. military personnel had further declined to 2,655,389.

President Johnson's refusal to allow budget requests to follow, even remotely, the actual course of events in Vietnam was to plague the military up to the fiscal 1968 budget. For instance, in fiscal 1966 his initial defense spending request was only \$46.8 billion, but once again, a supplemental appropriation of \$13.1 billion was required later in the year.

Again, in fiscal 1967, although the main defense appropriation jumped approximately \$11.2 billion, a supplemental appropriation of \$12.2 billion was requested and received later in the year.

The effect on military procurement—particularly the so-called "long leadtime" items requiring commitment well in advance of actual delivery—was devastating from 1963 through 1966.

Korea—The forgotten lesson

To a frightening degree, these events paralleled the mistakes made over a decade earlier by another Democratic Administration in Korea. Said President Johnson in his January 1967 Budget Message to Congress:

"A year ago we were in the midst of a rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam. Rather than submit a budget to the Congress based on highly uncertain estimates, I requested funds sufficient to finance the conflict through fiscal year 1967. At the present time the situation is different. While unforeseen events can upset the most careful estimate, we are in a much better position to determine our future requirements in Vietnam. As a consequence, my 1968 budget provides for those requirements on a continuing basis, including the possibility of an extension of combat beyond the end of the fiscal year."

Said the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee 14 years earlier, in May 1953:

"To touch specifically on the budgetary guidelines, it has been testified that the planners could not plan properly for the Korean War because one of the assumptions was that it would be over by the beginning of the fiscal year which was being planned. Budget requests were based on the amount of ammo used plus the replacement of reserve stocks with no thought that the War would continue for a longer period of time."

"In hindsight this is a most unrealistic policy or assumption. It may well have had an adverse effect on our military planners. We know that applied to the Korean ammunition program, an adverse effect occurred somewhere because no substantial quantity of ammunition was produced, and this was responsible for depleting our existing stocks. This is the result of partial mobilization."

Finally, in 1967, Mr. McNamara was to admit:

"Since we can now project our requirements for the conflict in Southeast Asia with far greater confidence than last year, we have changed our basic approach in preparing the FY 1967 Supplemental as well as the FY 1968 Budget. Sufficient funds are being requested in both the FY 1967 Supplemental and the FY 1968 Budget to protect the production leadtime. . . ."

In belated recognition of this fact, the initial Defense Budget request this year is fully \$75 billion.

Peace proposals, 1964

After President Kennedy's assassination, repeated newspaper stories told of attempts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to arrange for some sort of peace negotiations between Hanoi and Washington. Their authenticity was denied by the Johnson Administration.

Today we know that Mr. Thant, in September 1964, made a serious proposal to Hanoi and Washington that they secretly send representatives to Rangoon, Burma to discuss the Vietnam war. Hanoi accepted the proposal yet Washington turned it down.

According to the late Adlai Stevenson, the Johnson Administration refused to discuss peace in Vietnam with Hanoi because of the possible effect on the 1964 elections.

Secretary Thant agreed to wait. After President Johnson's overwhelming reelection, he again made the proposal. Hanoi again agreed but the Johnson Administration, through Secretary McNamara, once again refused.

When *The New York Times* on March 9, 1965 reported that U Thant had undertaken to arrange for such negotiations, Mr. Johnson's State Department denied that it had in fact rejected the Thant proposals.

Only after Eric Severeld published his articles in the November 30, 1965, *Look* concerning the late U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, including Stevenson's revelations about the Thant mission, did the State Department at long last admit the existence of the Thant proposal and that it had been rejected.

This episode, when added to the host of other incidents, utterances, misleading statements, half-truths, outright untruths, emphasizes the hallmark of the Johnson Administration in the conduct of the Vietnam war—a complete lack of candor.

The Americanization of the war

President John Kennedy once remarked the war in Vietnam could be won only so long as it was their war. If it were ever converted into a white man's war, we would lose as the French had lost a decade earlier. In the French period, Paris had some 5,000 to 7,000 administrators, plus the French colonials, in Vietnam. Their troop commitment reached 272,000.

Today, the United States has roughly 500,000 military men in Southeast Asia, plus about 30,000 American civilian administrators, with more of each to come, and with Americans doing most of the fighting.

How did this war become Americanized? As the record has shown, a qualitative shift in the American commitment in 1961—from arms, money, and advisors to armed combat troops—set the stage for increased United States involvement. It also set the stage for the next shift in our commitment, this time a quantitative change.

On February 7, 1965, eight Americans were killed, 62 wounded in a guerrilla attack by the Viet Cong. President Johnson promptly ordered the American Air Force into a retaliatory attack on targets in North Vietnam. Soviet Prime Minister Kossygin was in Hanoi at the time of the first bombing attack.

Correspondents on the scene have speculated Kossygin had gone to Hanoi on a mission to wean North Vietnam away from Peking. The Chinese Communists had not given Hanoi as much material support as promised. Kossygin was in Hanoi to promise Ho Chi Minh more supplies and equipment.

The bombing, when it came, gave the Soviet Union its "reason"—for public consumption, at least—for making such an offer. On February 9, Kossygin made his first public announcement of stepped-up Soviet support for the Hanoi regime.

Each of the first three raids, we carefully notified Moscow, were in retaliation for specific attacks against American military personnel in South Vietnam.

Bombing and troops—Up and up

During this period the military situation in South Vietnam was deteriorating badly. Vietnamese army units were being defeated daily; the Vietnamese army was losing a battalion a week; district capitals were falling weekly; village strongpoints were being overrun nightly.

Within this framework the President stepped up the bombing of North Vietnam, no longer as retaliatory raids but as an effort to break the supply route to the South which Ho was using to supply the Viet Cong. American military strength in

South Vietnam began to climb dramatically; by mid-1965 we had 53,000 ground troops in Vietnam and by year's end over 200,000.

The escalation continued through 1966. Our bombings, formerly tactical—to interdict supply routes—were now strategic, as well, aimed at whatever steel mills, power plants, industrial complexes existed. By spring of 1967, the United States had committed 500,000 men to a land war in Asia and was spending, for that conflict alone, one-fifth of its entire national budget.

In casualties, there are over 9,000 Americans dead; 50,000 wounded.

We have lost over 1,200 airplanes and nearly 800 helicopters.

Yet at the beginning of April 1967, the United States and South Vietnamese were able to claim control over fewer villages and hamlets than in 1962.

Administration policy

In 1961 the State Department issued a white paper on Vietnam which emphasized the indigenous nature of the conflict. It said in part:

"The basic pattern of Viet Cong (Vietnamese Communist) activity is not new, of course. It operated, with minor variations, in China, and Mao Tse-tung's theories on the conduct of guerrilla warfare are known to every Viet Cong agent and cadre. *Most of the same methods were used in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos. If there is anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation, it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is directed and supported with both personnel and material.*" (Emphasis added)

By 1965 the indigenous character of the Viet Cong was being played down in favor of the new theme; that is, aggression from the north. Said the 1965 State Department white paper on Vietnam, in part:

"The war in Vietnam is a new kind of war, a fact as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world. Much of the confusion that prevails in the thinking of many people, and even many governments, stems from this basic misunderstanding. For in Vietnam a totally new brand of aggression has been loosed against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom."

"Vietnam is not another Greece, where indigenous guerrilla forces used friendly neighboring territory as a sanctuary. (Emphasis State's own)

"Vietnam is not another Malaya, where Communist guerrillas were, for the most part, physically distinguishable from the peaceful majority they sought to control."

"Vietnam is not another Philippines, where Communist guerrillas were physically separated from the source of their moral and physical support."

Perhaps the State Department was correct in its new assessment of the nature of the war. Perhaps, too, the increased North Vietnamese involvement was to match increased U.S. commitment to battle.

Preconditions to negotiations

This second white paper was issued during a three-week lull between the first retaliatory air raids on North Vietnam in 1965 and the commencement of sustained bombing. During this lull, U Thant, recognizing the possibility of retaliation turning into open warfare, approached Hanoi and Washington with a renewed plea for negotiations.

The Johnson Administration at this point laid down what seemed to be two basic preconditions to peace negotiations:

(1) That Hanoi accept South Vietnam as a separate and independent State.
(2) That Hanoi agree to pull all forces out of the South.

Meanwhile, a separate appeal had come from the conference of 17 so-called non-

aligned nations meeting at Belgrade asking Hanoi to negotiate. Both appeals—Thant's and the nonaligned nations'—were dismissed by Hanoi on grounds the United States had already rejected any negotiations on a "no-preconditions" basis.

Johnson position hardens

In retrospect, it is clear the Johnson Administration did not wish to negotiate during this period. The Saigon government controlled barely 20 percent of South Vietnam. Its generals made no bones of the fact they were losing to the Viet Cong. To come to the bargaining table in hopes of salvaging an independent South Vietnam would be asking the impossible. In 1954, at Geneva, Ho Chi Minh had agreed to relinquish the area of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel in return for nationwide elections in 1956, elections which failed to materialize. For the U.S. to hope for similar concessions in 1965 was unrealistic.

In commenting on the President's attitude toward negotiations at this time, Senator Albert Gore (D., Tenn.) said:

"We know that at one time President Johnson opposed negotiation. He was very much opposed to negotiation or a negotiated settlement at the time I suggested more than a year ago. . . . Fortunately at his speech at Johns Hopkins (in April 1965), he changed his strategy and came to what I think was a far more realistic defensible, feasible position."

President Johnson added to the confusion surrounding a negotiated settlement when, on March 25, 1965, he said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in Southeast Asia."

Did the President indeed wish to return to the essentials of the 1954 Geneva Agreement? To hold nationwide elections in Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? To withdraw all foreign troops as provided for at Geneva? To reunite North and South Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? Or was the U.S. position really the one stated by Dean Rusk February 25, 1965, i.e. that Hanoi must accept South Vietnam as a separate, independent state?

Again, contradiction within the welter of statements coming from the Johnson Administration confuses not only Americans, but allies, bystanders and enemy alike. If a policy of deliberate obfuscation was desired, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Johnson succeeded. Clearly, too many "official" statements have been made by too many different officials, shaped and adapted to the wants of too many different audiences.

On April 13, 1965, Hanoi also hardened its position, laying down four principal points:

- "1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Viet Nam people: peace, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.
- "2. Pending peaceful reunification of Viet Nam, while Viet Nam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Viet Nam must be strictly respected; the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops and military personnel in their respective territory.
- "3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Viet Cong), without any foreign interference.
- "4. The peaceful reunification of Viet Nam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference."

Present political situation

The South Vietnamese Constituent Assembly in March 1967, adopted a new constitution for the Republic. It was promptly approved by the ruling junta of Marshal Ky.

The constitution provides for free elections throughout South Vietnam and on the surface seems to provide some hope for stability and political progress.

However, with the Viet Cong controlling at least 50 percent of the territory, and 40 percent of the population—and even more when the sun is down—the significance of the elections seems problematical. Elections for President are scheduled September 1, 1967.

It is also problematic as to how freely a newly-elected government can operate. The military, to date, has provided the most cohesive force in Vietnam, at least from our viewpoint. It can be assumed they will let go of the reins of power reluctantly, constitution or no constitution. The problem, however, is not simply the military in Saigon, according to seasoned Southeast Asia reporter, Marvin L. Stone, in his article "Vietnam—A Hopeless War?", in *U.S. News and World Report* for Dec. 5, 1966:

"At the top, it is a Government of power blocs and factionalism, in the French tradition. Leaders in Saigon are preoccupied fighting to keep their grasp on power.

"At just about every level below the top it is a Government of local fiefs, run by entrenched military sycophants or petty underpaid civil-service officials."

This, says Stone, means that District or Province chiefs in the countryside buy their jobs and impose their own "unofficial" forms of taxation to make a profit. The peasant has no place to turn for relief. Adds Stone:

"Saigon's land-reform program, so vital to the aspirations of peasants, has never really been put in motion. In the secure areas, tenant farmers—that means 70 per cent of all farmers in the Delta—still are forced to pay up to 50 per cent and more of their rice crops to absentee landlords who have absolutely no obligation in return. A law on the books since 1955 sets the limit at 25 per cent.

"Americans here insist that no progress will be made so long as the men at the top in Saigon are members of mandarin families, or allied with families which have vested interests in land that they have no intention of relinquishing."

Peace feelers, 1965-66

The year 1965 marks the beginning of an enormous number of proposals from all over the globe for peaceful negotiations. They can be summarized as follows:

Reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference to effect a cease fire and eventual peace.

Direct negotiations between Washington and Hanoi.

A mediation effort through U Thant. Resort to the U.N. General Assembly or Security Council as mediators.

Negotiations between Saigon and Hanoi. Negotiations to achieve a neutral federation of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. Negotiations between Saigon and the NLF-Viet Cong with Hanoi and Washington backstopping each side.

Negotiations between Saigon, Hanoi, and the NFL with a neutral nation acting as chairman.

Informal discussions between Hanoi and Washington in a neutral country to determine whether any grounds for formal negotiations exist.

It is physically impossible to compare the texts of each of the proposals and note all the differences, all the conditions, whether they are factual, semantic, or mere nuance. Nor can each such proposal be detailed. For these reasons, this study is confined to the last known U.S. position, contained in President Johnson's letter to Ho Chi Minh of February 1967, and in the exchange between U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Mr. Johnson.

Previous Administration utterances—at Johns Hopkins in 1965, the Hawaii Conference of December 1965, the Manila Conference of 1966 and the Guam Conference of

1967—while significant, must be considered in the context of domestic American politics, in the context of current world opinion, and in the context of the actual military situation in Vietnam at the particular time they were issued.

Thus the present position of Mr. Johnson and his advisors is the only truly useful benchmark in this spring of 1967. It is, as best as can be judged, contained in the texts of a letter from President Johnson to President Ho Chi Minh, dated February 2, 1967, and in the North Vietnamese leader's reply, dated February 15, 1967, and translated from the French in Washington:

President Johnson's letter

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you in the hope that the conflict in Vietnam can be brought to an end. That conflict has already taken a heavy toll—in lives lost, in wounds inflicted, in property destroyed and in simple human misery. If we fail to find a just and peaceful solution, history will judge us harshly.

"Therefore, I believe that we both have a heavy obligation to seek earnestly the path to peace. It is in response to that obligation that I am writing directly to you.

"We have tried over the past several years, in a variety of ways and through a number of channels, to convey to you and your colleagues our desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. For whatever reasons, these efforts have not achieved any results.

"It may be that our thoughts and yours, our attitudes and yours, have been distorted or misinterpreted as they passed through these various channels. Certainly that is always a danger in indirect communication.

"There is one good way to overcome this problem and to move forward in search for a peaceful settlement. That is for us to arrange for direct talks between trusted representatives in a secure setting and away from the glare of publicity. Such talks should not be used as a propaganda exercise, but should be a serious effort to find a workable and mutually acceptable solution.

"In the past two weeks, I have noted public statements by representatives of your Government suggesting that you would be prepared to enter into direct bilateral talks with representatives of the U.S. Government, provided that we ceased "unconditionally" and permanently our bombing operations against your country and all military actions against it. In the last day, serious and responsible parties have assured us indirectly that this is in fact your proposal.

"Let me frankly state that I see two great difficulties with this proposal. In view of your public position, such action on our part would inevitably produce worldwide speculation that discussions were under way and would impair the privacy and secrecy of those discussions. Secondly, there would inevitably be grave concern on our part whether your Government would make use of such action by us to improve its military position.

"With these problems in mind, I am prepared to move even further toward an ending of hostilities than your Government has proposed in either public statements or through private diplomatic channels. I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped. These acts of restraint on both sides would, I believe, make it possible for us to conduct serious and private discussions leading toward an early peace.

"I make this proposal to you now with a specific sense of urgency arising from the imminent new year holidays in Vietnam. If you are able to accept this proposal I see no reason why it could not take effect at the end of the new year, or Tet, holidays. The proposal I have made would be greatly strengthened if your military authorities and those of the Government of South Viet-

nam could promptly negotiate an extension of the Tet truce.

"As to the site of the bilateral discussions I propose, there are several possibilities. We could, for example, have our representatives meet in Moscow where contacts have already occurred. They could meet in some other country such as Burma. You may have other arrangements or sites in mind, and I would try to meet your suggestions.

"The important thing is to end a conflict that has brought burdens to both our peoples and above all to the people of South Vietnam. If you have any thoughts about the actions I propose, it would be most important that I receive them as soon as possible."

Ho Chi Minh's reply

"YOUR EXCELLENCY: On 10 February 1967, I received your message. This is my reply.

"Vietnam is thousands of miles away from the United States. The Vietnamese people has never done any harm to the United States. But contrary to the pledges made by its representative at the 1954 Geneva conference, the U.S. Government has ceaselessly intervened in Vietnam; it has unleashed and intensified the war of aggression in South Vietnam with a view to prolonging the partition of Vietnam and turning South Vietnam into a neocolony and a military base of the United States. For over two years now, the U.S. Government has with its air and naval forces carried the war to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an independent and sovereign country.

"The U.S. Government has committed war crimes, crimes against peace and against mankind. In South Vietnam, half a million U.S. and satellite troops have resorted to the most inhuman weapons and the most barbarous methods of warfare, such as napalm, toxic chemical and gases, to massacre our compatriots, destroy crops and raze villages to the ground.

"In North Vietnam, thousands of U.S. aircraft have dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs, destroying towns, villages, factories, roads, bridges, dikes, dams and even churches, pagodas, hospitals, schools. In your message, you apparently deplored the sufferings and destructions in Vietnam. May I ask you: Who has perpetrated these monstrous crimes? It is the U.S. and satellite troops. The U.S. Government is entirely responsible for the extremely serious situation in Vietnam.

"The U.S. war of aggression against the Vietnamese people constitutes a challenge to the countries of the Socialist camp, a threat to the national independence movement and a serious danger to peace in Asia and the world.

"The Vietnamese people deeply love independence, freedom and peace. But in the face of the U.S. aggression, they have risen up, united as one man. Fearless of sacrifices and hardships, they are determined to carry on their resistance until they have won genuine independence and freedom and true peace. Our just cause enjoys strong sympathy and support from the peoples of the whole world, including broad sections of the American people.

"The U.S. Government has unleashed the war of aggression in Vietnam. It must cease this aggression. That is the only way to the restoration of peace. The U.S. Government must stop definitively and unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. and satellite troops, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs. Such (is the basic) content of the four-point stand of the Government of the D.R.V., which embodies the essential principles and provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam. It is the basis of a correct political solution to the Vietnam problem.

"In your message, you suggested direct

talks between the D.R.V. and the United States. If the U.S. Government really wants these talks, it must first of all stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D.R.V. It is only after the unconditional cessation of the U.S. bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D.R.V. that the D.R.V. and the United States would enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

"The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.

"Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the U.S. Government will act in accordance with reason."

The second expression of position is contained in statements of U Thant in March 1967.

On March 28, U.N. Secretary General U Thant called a news conference and presented a new three-point peace formula that he had circulated secretly in mid-March. Mr. U Thant's formula was this:

First, a "general standstill truce . . . a halt to all military activities by all sides."

Second, preliminary talks between the United States and North Vietnam, attended either by Britain and the Soviet Union, as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam, and/or Canada, India, and Poland, as the International Control Commission for Vietnam.

Third, reconvening the Geneva Conference with both the South Vietnamese Government and the Viet Cong as participants.

The day before, Hanoi radio had broadcast U Thant's proposals, pointedly rebuffing United Nation's "interference" in Vietnam. U Thant held out hope that Hanoi had not "categorically" turned him down, while U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk treated Hanoi's negative response as a fatal blow to the Thant initiative.

Yet, as Washington congratulated itself on its good fortune in finding itself squarely in agreement with the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant had begun to slide back to his previous position that the U.S. must stop bombing North Vietnam as a necessary precondition to negotiations.

Meanwhile, Saigon was reported to be in agreement in principle with the U Thant three-point proposal, but displeased at being precluded from preliminary talks and "being treated like a puppet."

Thereafter, Washington qualified its acceptance of the same three-point proposal by saying "it is essential" to work out the details of the military cease-fire in advance.

And there the matter would seem to rest.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, there is a great amount of information to which only Mr. Johnson and his advisors have access. A review such as this must perforce rely on materials that have been made public by the Administration, or are obtainable from other public sources.

One other observation is necessary. Deep currents, Asian in origin, hold enormous sway over events in Vietnam yet cannot be adequately treated in a brief political history. A list of such currents is large, and would include the observation that Vietnam is basically Buddhist and Confucian, both ethical religious without a personal god. Thus, Asiatic communisms as espoused by Asiatics can masquerade as an ally in the older, more familiar struggle against Western theism, Western colonialism, and Western capitalism.

Such a list would necessarily include also the tragic involvement of Diem's brother Nhu with opium; the profound effect the writing of an obscure French Catholic philosopher, Emmanuel Mounier, was to have on Nhu and in turn on his lonely, celibate brother, Diem; the fact that Nhu and Diem translated Mounier's "personnalisme" ethic into a secret, authoritarian organization, the

"Can Lao" (Personalist Labor Revolutionary Party), to control all aspects of government and society in South Vietnam, thereby tragically destroying the coalition they had put together in 1954-55; even the distaste of individual Vietnamese in thousands of daily contacts at levels high and low for open, frank, Western speech compared to their own fluid, often subtle, conversational forms. These accidents of culture, history, and geography, for better or for worse, carry equally as much weight in the Vietnamese conflict today as, say, the effective fire power of the 7th fleet on a given day.

In a larger sense much more can be cited to confound the best of minds in resolving the Vietnamese conflict. The West divides good and evil, and thinks that evil can be conquered. Yet in Asia, a man is generally capable of believing that something is simultaneously good and bad, right and wrong, black and white, in such a manner as to render most difficult real understanding by the Western mentality.

Just as difficult to comprehend are the "politics" of the Buddhists, or the meaning of their proposals for a peaceful, independent Vietnam; we dismiss them as visionary or unrealistic, yet they may be more acceptable and understandable to the South Vietnamese—after 27 years of warfare—than anything we propose in our Western political terminology.

In short, we Americans cannot simply go to Asia, wipe the slate clean, and say to them, "This is how it shall be." The Vietnamese have their own view of nationalism, quite different from ours, the Vietnamese Communists identify with it, and it renders our involvement immeasurably difficult.

FURTHER DECISIONS

Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stops at the water's edge? That we must rally behind the President? Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?

Republicans—for two decades—have believed the United States must not become involved in a land war on the Asian continent. We are so involved today.

Republicans have believed that no American military intervention should be unilateral. Our commitment today in Vietnam is primarily unilateral.

Republicans, 1954, made a limited commitment to the South Vietnam Government. Under the Democrats, our commitment has become open-ended.

Before making any further decisions to support or differ with the President, Republicans might agree to seek hard, realistic answers to two basic questions:

1. What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos?

2. To what further lengths are we prepared to go in support of this interest?

APPENDIX I

Troop strength

	American ¹	Army of the Republic of Vietnam ¹	Vietcong ²
1961	3,164	338,000	63,400
1962	9,865	467,000	79,000
1963	16,500	525,000	91,700
1964	23,000	559,500	103,000
1965	181,000	679,000	230,000
1966	389,000	671,000	280,000
1967	430,000	650,000	287,000

¹ Source: 1961-66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

² South Vietnam Communists, strength in the south. Source: 1961-66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967. (Unable to obtain official estimates as to total number of regular North Vietnam troops in south.)

³ As of Apr. 1, 1967.

APPENDIX II
Casualties

	Americans killed ¹	Army of the Republic of Vietnam killed ²	Enemy killed ³
1960.....		2,200	5,669
1961.....		4,000	12,133
1962.....	42	4,400	21,168
1963.....	78	5,700	20,575
1964.....	147	7,500	16,785
1965.....	1,369	11,000	35,436
1966.....	5,008	9,400	55,524
1967.....	* 2,434	* 2,954	* 25,773
Total.....	9,078	47,154	193,053

¹ In hostile action. Source: Department of Defense.² Source: 1960-66: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, compiled from news dispatches.³ Source: Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.⁴ As of Apr. 15, 1967.⁵ As of Apr. 1, 1967.APPENDIX III
Casualties (wounded and noncombat dead)

	Americans dead	Americans wounded
1961.....		81
1962.....	23	411
1963.....	36	
1964.....	48	1,039
1965.....	359	6,114
1966.....	1,045	30,093
1967.....	1,398	16,350
Total.....	1,909	54,088

¹ As of Apr. 15, 1967.

Source: Department of Defense.

APPENDIX IV

	Enemy captured ¹	Enemy defections ²
1961.....	6,200	
1962.....	5,500	
1963.....	4,000	
1964.....	4,200	11,000
1965.....	6,000	5,500
1966.....	10,000	20,000
1967.....	* 1,000	* 8,000
Total.....	36,826	44,500

¹ Source: 1961-66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.² Source: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee.³ January 1967 only.⁴ As of Apr. 1, 1967.UNITED STATES SHOULD REAFFIRM
NATO COMMITMENT TO GREECE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House Republican Committee on Western Alliance urged President Johnson to reaffirm the U.S. NATO commitment to Greece. In a telegram, which I signed as chairman, the group said:

The United States should promptly and unequivocally reaffirm its commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty to aid Greece and other NATO nations automatically in case of armed attack.

The recent change in the government of Greece and the manner in which this came

about may tempt the Soviet Union or other Communist-oriented countries to aggravate the tensions which inevitably accompany such a change, and we therefore respectfully urge that you publicly reaffirm our defense commitment.

This development in Greece together with unrest and instability throughout the eastern Mediterranean constitutes a new peril to NATO and comes at a crucial time in its history. The alliance has not recovered from the shock and dislocations produced by the withdrawal of French forces from its integrated command and the exclusion of allied troops from France. Germany is concerned over the nuclear weapons treaty. Within a year members of NATO will be free to denounce the treaty.

The reaffirmation of our defense commitment must of course be accompanied by a strong expression of hope for an early return to constitutional processes in Greece. While we deplore the interruption of constitutional government there we must leave no doubt about our determination to protect that country from attack.

This initiative would help to repair damage done by a qualification of our NATO commitment to Turkey during the Cyprus crisis of 1964. In a letter to the Prime Minister of Turkey dated June 5, 1964, you stated, "I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies."

Whether or not so intended this letter had the effect of qualifying our automatic commitment to Turkey. Evidence of this appears in the reply of the Turkish Prime Minister who wrote on June 13, 1964: "Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of aggression. The only point left to the discretion of the member states is the nature and the scale of this assistance."

"If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression—the very foundations of the alliance would be shaken."

This qualification to which Turkey pointed has never been rescinded. With instability in the Mediterranean growing day by day, a new affirmation which will sweep away the earlier qualification is most urgent.

Both of these episodes—the Turkish threat to invade Cyprus in 1964 to protect its former nationals, and the recent military takeover of the Greek government—reveal an organic weakness in the structure of NATO. As so clearly stated in the official NATO Handbook (1965 edition) "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was not established to defend geographically homogeneous territory but was established primarily to defend a way of life."

We hope that the committee recently created by the North Atlantic Council to make a thorough study of the Alliance will give this its careful attention before reporting to the Ministerial Session of the Council next December.

BEATNIKS IN THE PENTAGON,
MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today we here in the House were shocked to learn of the fact that the peacenik marchers have nestled in the Pentagon. These people may have the right to a dissenting opinion, but Mr. Speaker, for us to allow them to use the Pentagon as a vehicle of distribution is unthinkable.

Apparently Secretary McNamara does not object, Mr. Speaker, or he would have had them thrown out as we did here in the Congress yesterday. Why should this country tolerate a Secretary of Defense who does not have the courage to take such action. Or is it, Mr. Speaker, that the White House has ordered hands off. The President is the Secretary's only boss and I strongly suggest that if Secretary McNamara will not touch these no-goodniks then it is only because he knows that his superior condones this type of activity.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as both a Member of Congress and a consulting engineer I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that our Nation's Capital is, this week, privileged to host the first International Congress of Consulting Engineers ever held in this country.

Consulting engineers are distinguishable from other engineers by virtue of their independence—for each is an entrepreneur, a professional in private practice. Their efforts may range from personal advisory services to complete engineering design of such complex facilities as O'Hare International Airport, or the world's longest suspension bridge—the Verrazano-Narrows in New York. Consultants cover such specialized fields as radar, metallurgy, solar heating, noise control, or munitions. All represent a vital, technological resource to their respective governments for it is they who are called upon to design highways, water systems, defense installations, and other public works.

This week's International Consulting Congress brings to this country outstanding engineers from 20 nations, including the highly industrialized areas of Western Europe as well as some of the lesser developed countries of South America and Africa. All are members of the 52-year-old Federation Internationale des Ingenieurs-Conseils which is headquartered in Belgium. Hosting the world meeting is the Consulting Engineers Council/USA, which is the largest and most active of all the organizations which make up the international group.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has estimated that American consulting engineering firms earn approximately \$300 million per year overseas. This amount is, however, a far cry from the consultants' overall contribution to the

international balance of payments. As designers of projects they often specify construction which includes equipment, materials and services available only from U.S. firms. During the period 1959-63 American engineers worked on 672 overseas projects with a total construction value of \$7.6 billion. Their magnificent role in designing military and defense installations in Vietnam constitutes one of the unsung sagas of that conflict.

Superlatives hold little awe for consulting engineers who are regularly being called upon to design the largest, fastest, longest, smallest or tallest. Chances are that the water we drink, the highways we traverse, even the conditioned air we breathe, is the product of consulting engineers.

In the light of this week's International Consulting Engineers Congress I ask that the Congress join me in welcoming the consulting engineering profession to our city and in extending best wishes to the delegates for an enjoyable and productive meeting.

TIME FOR LAWS TO PROTECT OUR FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join with the increasing number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are rising in defense of the American flag. I am introducing legislation that would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the flag of this Nation.

Although several States do already have such laws, there is no regulation or standard on the Federal level to protect the flag.

In recent weeks we have heard of an endless series of protests, demonstrations, and marches where our flag, as the symbol of the greatness and pride of this land, has been burned, trampled, torn, or otherwise mutilated. Most Americans are growing sick and tired of these irresponsible demonstrations. These flag burnings are nothing short of traitorous acts in the eyes of those loyal citizens who respect the flag as a tangible symbol of our heritage.

These actions are made all the more loathsome occurring as they do at the same time that thousands of our young men are risking and giving their lives to protect the precious rights for which the flag stands. Ironically, it stands, among others, for the right of dissent that protects its defilers.

The bill I am introducing provides that mutilation of the flag shall be made punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 and imprisonment of not more than 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal has been lauded not only by public officials and

citizens throughout the country, but also by patriotic organizations. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join with me in urging passage of this legislation.

I am heartened to see that in answer to all these anti-American activities we have another kind of demonstration—the patriotic rally. One such rally was recently held in Merritt Island, Fla., where schoolchildren and veterans marched and sang their way through an inspiring "We Love America" rally. I commend the following accounts of the rally, taken from local newspapers, to the attention of my colleagues:

[From Today, Apr. 27, 1967]

MARCH OF THE PATRIOTS

A fired-up band of Brevard young people will give their answer this weekend to the anti-war marchers.

They will call it the "We Love America" march.

Their route will be from Cocoa to the sea, the same path trod two weeks earlier by a couple of dozen young people who remain unconvinced America fights a just and moral war in Vietnam.

Only the "We Love America" troupe knows how their signs will read. But it's a safe bet the placards will make more sense than the likes of "Draft Beer, Not Boys."

The young people leading the Saturday parade rightfully call themselves patriots.

They are positive their display will "demonstrate beyond all doubt" the patriotism of Brevard County students.

It is unlikely their protest against the protestors of two weeks ago will attract very much attention beyond the confines of Brevard.

There will be those who will yell, others who will think "cornball" because the young people declare themselves patriots. That's a very old-fashioned, unstylish word in the 60s. But it has kept America great for many years.

And we are sure the young patriots are aware that as true patriots their feeling must go far beyond a mere physical demonstration of their love for their native land.

When an American says he loves his country, he must mean more than loving the rocks and rills of New England, the broad Midwest prairies gleaming under the goodness of God, the wide plains, the great mountains, the sandy beaches of Florida sloping gently to the sea.

When an American speaks of love of country his meaning only begins with physical glories or physical demonstrations.

Love of and for America means love for an inner air, an inner light in which freedom, as we know it, lives. It means love for a way of life in which a man can breathe the air of self-respect.

"We Love America" are easy words to say. But this is a mighty assignment we give ourselves.

It is often easier to fight—sometimes even easier to die—for principles than it is to live up to them.

[From the Cocoa Tribune, Apr. 28, 1967]

WE LOVE AMERICA MARCH TOMORROW

(By Will Land)

Merritt Island residents can make it three groups of marchers taking part tomorrow in Central Brevard's "We Love America" activities.

Islanders today were invited to gather at the First National Bank parking lot and join the hikers from Cocoa who will leave the Cocoa library at 10 a.m.

Another group will leave at 11 a.m. from the Publix Market parking lot at the A1A and SR520 intersection in Cocoa Beach.

They will all meet at Kiwanis Island, a

Merritt Island recreation complex, for a rally beginning at 12:30 p.m.

State Sen. Beth Johnson, county commissioner George King Jr., several teachers and a representative of Sheriff Leigh Wilson will speak at the rally.

The march and rally has attracted the support of various civic and fraternal organizations and business firms.

The county commissioners have declared tomorrow "We Love America" day in Brevard, and residents are being urged to fly flags and join the march.

Groups pledging to participate in the march include several drum and bugle corps, many local VFW and American Legion posts and their Ladies Auxiliaries, and numerous Boy Scout troops.

Cocoa Beach motel and business marquees are scheduled to display "We Love America" messages to commemorate the activities.

Leonard Hays, 20, a Brevard Junior College student, and Tracy-Lynn Weir, 17, a Cocoa High School student, are credited with organizing the march.

It is a reaction to a "Peace March" here two weeks ago to protest American involvement in Vietnam.

Miss Weir said she and Hays saw the demonstration, heard the arguments and were appalled that "everybody was anti-American."

[From the Brevard Sentinel, Apr. 30, 1967]

MARCHERS PROVE PATRIOTISM POPULAR IN BREVARD

MERRITT ISLAND.—In protest to recent anti-American demonstrations throughout the country, marchers from grade school and grizzled veterans of past wars marched and sang their way to a patriotic rally here Saturday.

The red, white and blue of the American flags the marchers carried snapped briskly in the wind as youngsters and their parents left Cocoa Beach and Cocoa to meet here at Kiwanis Island.

As marchers and card carrying members of the various veterans organizations arrived at Kiwanis Island, the rally took on the air of a Fourth of July celebration.

District Two County Commissioner George King Jr., his beard grown long for the Titusville centennial celebration, addressed the crowd dressed in the garment of Abraham Lincoln saying, "If this portrayal of Mr. Lincoln can be just a reminder then it has well served its purpose."

King added, "It bothers me that few men will get to their feet and publicly endorse the philosophy of the government. 'I had begun to wonder what happened to the spirit of America,' he said, adding that it was this spirit which evolves from the interrelationship of Christian morality and individual responsibility.

The spirit of America was also the concern of another speaker, Ralph Paz, president of the Mid-County Republican Club who added that all Americans should continue the esprit de corps that was alive when the country was young.

Brevard County's State Sen. Beth Johnson of Cocoa Beach was also on hand for the rally. She said, "I love America and I'm proud to be a part of her."

Other speakers included Dick Thompson, another Republican leader, Clinton Deval, social science teacher at Cocoa High School and Steve Valvanis, Brevard Junior College political science instructor.

Cocoa Beach marchers started out at Canaveral Plaza Shopping Plaza toward Kiwanis Island under the watchful eye of Cocoa Beach policemen who shepherded them along the highways and across the temporary bridge over the Banana River.

Many of the policemen, their duties discharged, stayed to hear and applaud the speakers.

[From the Brevard Sentinel, Apr. 29, 1967]

EVERYONE URGED TO JOIN PARADE

(By Ralph Bates)

COCOA.—"The March for America" in support of America and American foreign policy, has grown to where it will receive national coverage on this patriotic day.

A Life magazine crew from Miami, an Air Force camera crew from Orlando Air Force Base, and other news media will be on hand to record the events of the day.

The Cocoa Veterans of Foreign Wars, including the ladies auxiliary, are in full support of the march as are leading citizens, public officials, businesses, and civic and community organizations.

County Comm. George King Jr. will be the principal speaker for the rally at Kiwanis Island. Other speakers will be State Sen. Beth Johnson; County Democratic Executive Committee Chairman, William Mullon; Republican County Executive Committee Chairman, Richard Thompson; Cocoa High School teacher, Cliff DeVoe, and Brevard Junior College Instructor Steve Valvanis. The Rev. Adrian Rogers, pastor of First Baptist Church Merritt Island will give the invocation.

The board of county commissioners has proclaimed Saturday as "We Love America Day" for Brevard County, and citizens and organizations are urged to fly their American flags and march.

The Cocoa group will form at 10 a.m. in the parking lot behind the Cocoa Public Library for the march to Merritt Island.

They will proceed on Church Street to Delannoy Avenue and then east of Florida 520 to the island.

The parking lot behind the First National Bank of Merritt Island has been designated as the meeting place for those people desiring to join with the Cocoa marchers as they arrive at that point.

The Cocoa Beach marchers will form their group at the Publix market parking lot at 11 a.m. They will then proceed west on Florida 520 to the recreation center.

People are reminded that the center has picnic tables and facilities and to bring their lunches for the afternoon's events.

THEY MUST WANT TO SEE US KILLED

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed at the contrast between the men who use freedom and the men who defend it. As an example, a letter to the editor, published May 6, 1967, in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, states the significance to one American soldier in Vietnam of the actions of a group of Ohio professors who are seeking a "reasonable" settlement of the war.

On the one hand is the Columbus soldier, Sp4c. Edward I. Arthur. This soldier "has been all over South Vietnam." In contrast, the professors, in all probability, have merely been all over the front pages of newspapers from here to Hanoi.

Specialist Arthur answers the charge that the National Liberation Front is supported by a large number of the Vietnamese people by citing the terrorist tac-

tics that force a villager to comply or pronounce his family's death sentence.

The man who is doing the fighting says that 90 percent of the South Vietnamese are against Communist rule and that—

Only about 10 percent of the people go along with the Reds. These nuts are just like those we have at home in the same category—like the professors who signed the open letter.

In answer to the charge of fighting the Vietcong, that is, civil war forces, this soldier says:

The people we are fighting are not Viet Cong for the most part, but NVAs from the North.

And to the charge that the United States should stop bombing the north, Specialist Arthur adeptly sums up the GI's feelings by saying: "They must want to see us killed."

Mr. Speaker, men like this soldier are fighting for freedom, they have accepted a responsibility to their Nation. In contrast, persons like these professors apparently have failed to accept the responsibility for finding out the facts about the war and their half-informed conclusions can be deadly.

I think we can all benefit from reading this letter. It represents the views of those who are sweating in the filthy danger of a Southeast Asian jungle for the freedom of the "folks back home," some of whom are attempting to verbally slit their throats.

For those who are seeking a reasonable settlement—and no sane man wants war—I would ask, reasonable to whom? To the South Vietnamese people and others throughout the world who seek freedom? To Sp4c. Edward I. Arthur, and more than 400,000 like him? I think the vast majority of Americans will stand with Specialist Arthur.

I place this letter in the RECORD at this point:

COLUMBUS GI FIGHTING IN VIETNAM REPLIES TO PROFESSORS' OPEN LETTER

To the Editor:

I have just seen a copy of the April 6 Dispatch which contained the "Open Letter to President Johnson" signed by the "Committee of Ohio Professors for a Reasonable Settlement in Vietnam."

This paid ad claims the people of South Vietnam would like for the U.S. to get out of their country. This is not true.

These professors claim the National Liberation Front is supported by a large number of the Vietnamese people.

Ha! If you were ordered by armed thugs to do as you were told or your wife and children would be killed and your home taken over, would you tell them to get out?

I have been all over South Vietnam and I have found 90 percent of the people are for getting the Communists out of their country.

Only about 10 percent of the people go along with the Reds. These nuts are just like those we have at home in the same category—like the professors who signed the open letter.

I am in the field here in South Vietnam and have been for a long time. The people we are fighting are not Viet Cong for the most part, but NVAs from the north.

They have come south to kill and take over the country. The people in the south are fighting to stop that, as they have a perfect right to.

I hope the people back in the U.S. will not be taken in by the likes of these Ohio professors who signed the open letter to the President.

It would be nice to be back home in Columbus and not get shot at, to eat regular meals, sleep well and watch television, but like the men in South Vietnam we are trying to help them save their country for freedom.

These professors say to stop bombing the north. They must want to see us killed.

Bombing escalation is needed to show the Communists they are not going to take over this land. If we stopped bombing, the NVAs would be swarming all over the south.

I try, but I just can't understand people like these professors. As a free man and with God's help, I'll never stop fighting to keep the Communists from taking over.

Spec. 4 EDWARD I. ARTHUR,
U.S. Army, South Vietnam.

WE SHOULD PRESERVE FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDOMS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment is one of our hallowed freedoms guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

The right of television and radio broadcasters as well as newspapers to comment on public issues must be preserved. Although it is a right, it is also a trust. Some abuse that trust, but it is my feeling that the vast majority do not. Certainly, the dangers in curbing the right of fair comment outweigh the small benefit to be derived in suppressing the irresponsible few. For that reason, I feel compelled to speak out against recent proposals that would unduly restrict the rights of a broadcaster to editorialize on issues affecting the public interest.

With the current trend of fewer and fewer daily newspapers in our cities, the burden of commenting on issues affecting the public has become greater on the radio and television industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to my colleagues a resolution in support of broadcaster editorializing which has been recently approved by the board of directors of the Nebraska Broadcasters Association. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas both the Congress and the Supreme Court have consistently recognized that broadcasting is a medium protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and

Whereas for the past seventeen years the Federal Communications Commission has upheld the right of a broadcaster to editorialize on issues of public controversy, and

Whereas existing local, state and federal ordinances and laws are adequate to resolve the facts and issues which may arise when local broadcasters do editorialize.

Now therefore be it resolved that the Nebraska Association of Broadcasters does vigorously oppose any legislation that would impose limits on the rights and responsibilities of a broadcaster to editorialize on any issue of public interest or concern.

IN DEFENSE OF THE FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is again beset with war and internal strife which threatens to tear asunder the very things upon which this great Nation is founded, a refreshing bit of Americana was wafted into my office today to remind me, and now you and my colleagues, that in each city and hamlet of America still lives that spirit which inspired early settlers to defend their country, and their flag, to the death, if you please.

However, this refreshing breath of freedom's faith comes not from some adult group but, instead, from the eighth-graders of Burlington Junior High School, Burlington, Wis. A letter above the 218 signatures commends me for my activity in the line of legislation which would make it a Federal offense to publicly destroy or maliciously deface the American flag. My bill, H.R. 9208, and other similar bills are pending before Congress at this time. With this petition of thanks from youngsters who still feel Old Glory means something, I again appeal to you gentlemen to take swift action to halt the defacing or destruction of our flag.

These 218 students have ended their letter—which follows—with a pledge to lend their wholehearted support to "your noble and 'truly American' effort." Let us pledge ourselves to passing legislation which will help this Nation retain some measure of that dignity which has been our heritage and for which our gallant young men are now fighting, and dying, in some far-off land.

The letter follows:

BURLINGTON JUNIOR HIGH,
Burlington, Wis.

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
Longworth Congressional Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: It was with a tremendous amount of satisfaction that we, the eighth grade Social Studies classes of Burlington Junior High School, Burlington, Wisconsin, learned of your fine efforts to introduce legislation that would make it a federal offense to publicly destroy or maliciously deface the American flag.

Can we justify sending thousands of fine American men to their death in defense of our flag while we allow it to be destroyed in our own country? When misguided individuals are allowed to deface or destroy our flag, a part of our democracy dies with it because our flag is a symbol of our democracy and will be free.

To this end, we the undersigned students pledge to you our wholehearted support in your noble and "Truly American" efforts.

Respectfully yours,

BURLINGTON JUNIOR HIGH, EIGHTH GRADE
SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENTS.

CURTAILMENT OF AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in further support of legislation to restrict harmful agricultural imports, which I have introduced in the House earlier in this session, I call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution recently passed by the 1967 Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

It is good to note that the legislature of my home State, where I had the privilege to serve for 8 years, recognizes the problem that American agriculture is facing and has seen fit to call this to the attention of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress in this manner. I commend them for their action.

I hereby insert this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION No. 5

A resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to curtail agricultural imports

Whereas, agricultural prices have now declined to 74 percent of parity; and

Whereas, agricultural prices have declined in recent months at the alarming rate of seven percent; and

Whereas, the severe underpayment for agricultural production places in jeopardy all of rural America; and

Whereas, at this time the nation's dairy farmers are engaged in an all out effort dedicated to price improvement for dairy commodities; and

Whereas, capital inputs in today's economy are limited in agriculture and are not a complete substitute for the family farm and its family labor force; and

Whereas, present agricultural policies are crippling and destroying the efficiency of our food-making industry and stimulating the decay of rural communities; and

Whereas, this nation must have sufficient resources in agriculture—in people, machinery and other materials of production—to provide abundance for the American people and also to provide food and fibre for sharing with hungry people in other nations; and

Whereas, the present administration has failed to provide for equal justice in this essential area of the nation's economy; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that it hereby petitions the President, Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to curb price depressing importation of agricultural commodities and products; and

Be it further resolved that the federal government continue to resist price depressing agricultural imports until such time as agricultural prices to the American farmer are in balance and in keeping with the cost of production, and

Be it further resolved that the federal government immediately take all necessary steps to provide a return to the dairy producers in sufficient amount to assure a necessary and vital supply for the great needs of this country;

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable

Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader of the United States Senate; and the members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK M. MOORE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as the delays and difficulties of our Vietnam sea-lift continue and as our obsolete reserve fleet and merchant vessels prove to be more and more inadequate, I think it is important to keep before the Congress and the people the extreme urgency of correcting this situation. For this reason, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent address delivered recently in the famous shipbuilding city of Quincy, Mass.

The address was given by Capt. Frank M. Moore, a constituent of my district who has spent 40 years in the U.S. Navy Reserves and in the merchant marine. Captain Moore is well qualified by his long experience to speak about the vital role of our merchant marine and its tragic decline over the past 20 years. The text which I am including in the RECORD gives a very clear picture of the need for a modern merchant fleet to carry America's important foreign trade and to hold our own in the worldwide competition for mastery of the seas. I hope that these remarks will be read with the attention which this great problem merits.

The address follows:

REMARKS MADE TO QUINCY KIWANIS CLUB,
APRIL 17, 1967, BY CAPT. FRANK M. MOORE,
OF MARSHFIELD, MASS.

It is difficult to draw a clear and concise picture of the importance of our merchant marine as related to the other segments of our economy. To the average shore-side worker, engrossed as he must be in the problems of his own industry, his family welfare and educational requirements, the merchant marine is something remote and vaguely related to the days of the Yankee clipper ships. Most people do, of course, realize that there is a huge volume of cargo which must be transported over great distances but the problem is so immense and remote that they feel individually they can do little about it and they just hope that "someone is minding the store."

To orient your thinking I propose to use a hypothetical situation which is admittedly an over-simplification. Let us suppose that the home delivery of all sales was essential to the survival of two such firms as Macy and Gimbels. Can anyone think that Macy would rely on Gimbels' trucking service in this essential matter? Yet, in our ocean transport we rely 92% on the ships of our competitors to deliver our manufactured goods to our customers and to supply us with our essential raw materials. There are 100 strategic raw materials which are not found in North America. We import 98% of our manganese; 86% of our nickel; 85% of our aluminum ore; 44% of our zinc; in fact, the U.S. economy consumes 50% of the non-agricultural world's raw materials. Relying 92% on foreign shipping is a somewhat hazardous position in which to place ourselves.

On the slippery world road which we are forced to travel today, our technological, in-

dustrial and agricultural production is the envy of every country in the world. Our so-called friends and allies are not averse to seeing us stumble a little and maybe bark our shin. Many other countries frankly hope we fall and break our neck. Under such conditions it is hardly realistic to rely on foreign shipping for 92% of our required ocean transportation.

Also involved in this matter is the deficit in our balance of payments from foreign trade. The billions of dollars we pay to foreign vessels as freight money, if paid to U.S. shipping, would go far toward eliminating this deficit.

Our Vietnam sea-lift has exposed the weakness of our merchant marine. Some years ago it was said the next war would be short and could be supplied primarily by air. However, 95% of our troops and supplies for Vietnam are transported by ships. In order to accomplish this we have had to withdraw ships from trade routes on which we did have a toe-hold. We have had to recondition, at abnormally high cost, all the old 20 to 25 year old ships we had in reserve since World War II. The maintenance and repair costs of these old and inefficient ships are much higher than normal and it seems probable that they will all reach the point of obsolescence at approximately the same time—and that time fairly soon.

Use of foreign shipping to alleviate our shipping problem proved unsatisfactory. Many countries prohibited their ships from participating in this trade. In other cases, ships were loaded and foreign crews refused to sail. The ships had to be unloaded.

It is ironic that the trade routes from which we had to withdraw ships are being pre-empted by foreign shipping. It is more ironic to see ships of these same countries delivering fertilizer plants, busses and machinery to Cuba and, in some instances, even delivering war materials to North Vietnam.

Japan and Korea profit greatly from our Vietnam problem, and also contribute to our balance of payment deficit, by manufacturing most of the uniforms and shoes needed by our troops. Not because we cannot manufacture uniforms and shoes, but because we do not have the ships to deliver them.

So it would seem that the problems of our Vietnam supply lines justify a close and hard look at our national maritime policy.

However, there is another aspect to this maritime problem and, over the long term, probably a more important area of concern. In the mid 1950s Russia declared a firm policy to extend their maritime influence to the oceans of the world. In recent years the USSR has shifted the major area of conflict from military, or quasi-military, to the arena of economics and industrial management. This increases the importance of the merchant marine and makes the ability to carry a substantial proportion of our ocean transport a more vital consideration. The present Soviet merchant fleet is 8½ M dwt.—approximately equal to our active merchant fleet. Russia plans to have 20M dwt. by 1980.

The USSR carries 75% of their foreign commerce under the Red flag—we carry 7.7% of our foreign trade in American ships.

In 1965 USA accepted delivery of 16 new merchant ships. The USSR accepted delivery of 129.

Our 1967 fiscal budget called for delivery of not more than 13 new merchant ships. The USSR had 464 new merchant ships on order. In other words, 24% of the production of the shipyards of the world is for account of the USSR. The shipyards of Japan, Great Britain, West Germany, etc., as well as those of the satellites such as Poland and etc., are busy building ships for the Soviets. Meanwhile, our 1968 fiscal budget again calls for the same as 1967—delivery of not more than 13 new merchant ships.

The Soviet merchant fleet serves 600 ports, in 91 different countries to which the USSR

maintains trade routes. And only 13 of these countries are communist. The USSR openly seeks to dominate the oceans of the world and hope to position themselves so that they can deny ocean services to any country which does not conform to Kremlin policy. A Congressional Sub-Committee, of which Congressman Hastings Keith of the Massachusetts 12th District was a member, recently made a trip to Russia. This Committee was told by Bakayev, USSF Minister of Merchant Marine, that their purpose was, "To gain control of the seas."

So the question arises, is something wrong with our maritime policy? Some of our present Administrators maintain we do not need any merchant marine at all. All we need is a fleet of Fast Deployment Logistic ships to fulfill the defense requirements of a merchant marine and ignore the commercial requirements entirely. In other words, we should rely 100% on foreign shipping for our raw materials and deliveries. To some others it seems we have no maritime policy at all.

Many persons who have made a serious study of this problem feel that the basic fault is that our present Maritime Administration is buried deep in the Department of Commerce—mired in bureaucratic red tape and obliged to submit plans and budget requirements through many devious channels.

The remedy proposed by this group is the establishment of an independent Maritime Administration able to submit their program and budget requirements direct to the Congress. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries endorses this plan and some 50 or more Congressmen have filed bills to create such an independent Maritime Administration.

Further recommendations of this group are that we:

1. Recognize the major role of our merchant marine in both peace and war.
2. Overcome public apathy.
3. Re-vitalize our shipyards and start building the merchant fleet, the fishing fleet, and the oceanographic vessels which modern competition requires.

In conclusion, it is interesting to look at the position of the shipbuilding countries of the world:

1. Japan; 2. Great Britain; 3. Sweden; 4. West Germany; 5. Italy; 6. Spain; 7. Norway; 8. France; 9. Poland; 10. Netherlands; 11. United States; 12. Denmark; 13. Yugoslavia; 14. Brazil; 15. Finland; 16. Australia.

It seems odd to see United States of America in 11th place between Netherlands and Denmark.

Some people say Japan is number one because Japanese shipyard labor is paid one third of the USA pay scale. However, Japanese labor is paid two annual bonuses which, together, generally equal their annual wage. It is hard to believe that we with our technological and industrial capabilities cannot re-vitalize our shipyards and make them competitive. And if it should require some government equalization subsidy, would not this be good insurance to protect our supply of raw materials and delivery of sales?

What can you as an individual do? Write your Congressman and tell him your thoughts. Ask for his opinion. Your Congressman is encouraged in his work when he hears from his constituents once in a while. And the men who are working to save our merchant marine need all the encouragement they can get right now!

PARITY RATIO CREDIBILITY GAP REVEALED

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may ex-

press his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that we now have another credibility gap in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Farmers have been discouraged because of the actions of their Government in doing many things that tend to hold down farm prices. They were not surprised, therefore, to read recently in the April 28 "Agricultural Prices" release of USDA that the parity ratio for April fell to 72 percent. This is the lowest rate since the summer of 1934.

Ever since the parity ratio was first used, it has been based on prices and not income.

In a deceiving effort to offset the impact on farmers that the relationship between the prices they receive and the prices they pay is as bad as it was in the depression years of 33 years ago, the USDA has now begun publishing an "adjusted parity ratio" every month.

The new "adjusted ratio" uses direct Government payments to farmers to increase the index prices received by farmers. This is obviously an effort to distort the sorry record of the Freeman administration.

A complicated formula has been developed by USDA to show that the "adjusted parity ratio" is now 77 percent—5 points above the regular parity ratio. However, this "adjusted ratio" is still 9 points below the comparable figure for April 1966.

To use direct Government payments to distort parity ratio is comparable to using figures on farmers' income from off-farm work and investments—higher now than in the 1910-14 base period—for the same purpose.

If USDA continues publishing an "adjusted ratio," farmers may conclude that the Department thinks the direct payment program has depressed farm prices.

Many of us in Congress who have been saying for years that a series of Department actions and policies has resulted in Government-wrecked market prices can well appreciate why USDA has again tried to fool the farmer.

It is my belief that farm people will resent this latest attempt to cover up their unfortunate position by those in USDA who are more interested in holding down farm prices than they are in letting the market system operate so farmers can get a better income.

I include in the Record the Agricultural Prices material to which I have referred at this point in my remarks:

PRICES RECEIVED INDEX DOWN 4 POINTS—PARITY INDEX UP 1 POINT—ADJUSTED PARITY RATIO 77

The Index of Prices Received by Farmers declined 4 points (1½ percent) during the month ended April 15 to 246 percent of its 1910-14 average, the Crop Reporting Board announced today. Contributing most to the decrease were lower prices for eggs, hogs, and wholesale milk. Partly offsetting were higher prices for lettuce and cattle. The index was 7 percent below April 1966.

The Index of Prices Paid for Commodities and Services, including Interest, Taxes, and

Farm Wage Rates rose 1 point (1/2 percent) during the month, as a result of an increase in the seasonally adjusted index of farm wage rates. At 341, the index was 8 points (2 percent) above a year earlier.

The preliminary Adjusted Parity Ratio, reflecting Government payments, which will be published monthly beginning with this issue, was 77, down 2 points from March.

The Parity Ratio declined 2 points to 72

Summary table

Index, 1910-14=100	Apr. 15, 1966	Mar. 15, 1967	Apr. 15, 1967	Record high	
				Index	Date
Prices received.....	265	250	246	313	February 1951.
Parity index ¹	333	340	341	341	April 1967.
Parity ratio.....	80	74	72	123	October 1946.
Adjusted parity ratio ² (preliminary).....	86	79	77	-----	-----

¹ Prices paid, interest, taxes, and farm wage rates based on data for indicated dates.

² The adjusted parity ratio, reflecting Government payments, averaged 86 for the year 1966, compared with 80 for the parity ratio. Preliminary adjusted parity ratios for the current year, supplied by the Economic Research Service, are based on estimated cash receipts from marketings and estimates of Government payments for the current calendar year. See p. 30 of this issue of Agricultural Prices for a description of the method of making current estimates of the adjusted parity ratio.

GIVE GOVERNOR REAGAN A CHANCE—HIS PLAUDITS ARE INCREASING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan was elected Governor of the largest State of the Union, he inherited some of the largest problems ever to burden a State.

His first efforts to keep faith with the voters, to follow through on his campaign commitments, to bring some order out of chaos, to rescue the State from insolvency, to develop a respect for law and order, and to cope with the growing problems of finance and student behavior at the State universities were lampooned, and ridiculed by the leftist and partisan news media, and by sulking defeated candidates and former administration officialdom.

Now that observers are able to evaluate Governor Reagan's efforts and accomplishments with more objectivity, the reaction is surprisingly more commendatory. Most citizens are applauding his ideas and efforts. Even the skeptics are saying, "Give him a chance; he obviously is trying with great effort to give California better government."

His official appointees have been superior in ability and in their dedication to California than any of their predecessors. His volunteers—a resource of extraordinary potential never before tapped by a Governor—have been making great contributions. The mail response from private citizens has far exceeded the mail of all previous Governors in quantity and percentage of approval.

Because California is a large State and because a great experiment in representative government is being conducted in California by Governor Reagan, I include two recent newspaper columns which pertain to Governor Reagan—one by Roscoe Drummond from the Washington Post of May 3, 1967, and one from the Sacramento Union of April 18, 1967.

I hope they are of interest to all Members.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 3, 1967]

IS REAGAN REAL?—GOVERNOR HAS LEARNED FROM BLUNDERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Ronald Reagan, as Governor, looks better closeup than at a distance.

The facts just do not support the impression which many east of the Rockies seem to have, that Reagan is some kind of conservative kook who is out to dismantle the government of the most populous State in the Nation and keep California's young people from getting an education.

I do not conclude that Reagan will turn out to be a distinguished Governor—or, in the end, even an effective Governor; it is too soon to know. But I have become convinced that his first four months in office show:

That his efforts to economize do not make him a reactionary bogeyman.

That the substance of what he is trying to achieve—less expensive, more efficient government which, he avows, "will never put dollars ahead of people"—is entirely reasonable.

That Reagan is quite aware that he has made political and tactical blunders which have got him into hot water—and he is learning from them.

That it is simply uninformed to dismiss Reagan as an actor playing Governor and premature to guess how he is going to look a year from now.

Such facts as the following about the Reagan record seem little known outside of California and they deserve to be better understood:

Reagan's top-level appointments reflect no reactionary mold. He is putting together a team of able administrators, some outstanding. He has retained three of Gov. Pat Brown's best men, named a Democrat head of the Water Resources Board because he was the most qualified, put a dedicated conservationist in charge of natural resources, placed a farm expert with Washington experience in the Eisenhower Administration in charge of California agriculture, and appointed a Negro to run veterans' affairs.

Reagan began his administration by trimming the state budget by \$127,000,000—more than half of what he hoped to save.

He has faced up to the necessity of some increase in sales and income taxes to cope with a deficit and to give some relief to excessively high property taxes.

He has shown that he is not afraid to tread on some toes, that he can make decisions and stand behind them, that he intends to redeem his campaign promises. He is proving in practice that the idea he is an empty-headed actor reading somebody else's script is bunk.

Reagan is being too hastily judged, not on the basis of what he is seeking to achieve but on the basis of a few tactical mistakes.

I am not saying that Reagan has landed securely on his feet. But the facts certainly do not justify suggesting that he has fallen on his face. He hasn't.

[From the Sacramento Union, Apr. 18, 1967]
MAKING A START—GOVERNOR MADE IMPACT IN FIRST HUNDRED DAYS

In his first major post-election speech at Coronado last November, Ronald Reagan, governor-elect, outlined what he considered among the most important tasks confronting his administration.

His administration, Reagan said, would go beyond correcting executive and other deficiencies and repealing certain laws as important as these functions must be for any governor.

"In our case (we) must change the entire attitude and approach of government. We cannot reverse a trend of years overnight, or even in one term. But we can make a start."

As columnists have noted, Gov. Reagan made an impact in his first 100 days in office. It has been an impact good for the state.

An analysis of state laws and other changes must of necessity wait until the Legislature adjourns. But there can be no denying that Gov. Reagan's appointments for the most part have been of top-notch executives who have rolled up their sleeves for the state at a fraction of the income their talents would command in private business. More than 150 businessmen additionally are contributing their time to analyze deficiencies in government.

Gov. Reagan has stopped the practice he called "magic bookkeeping" by the previous administration to give Californians the hard facts of life as brutal as they are, even as he had said he would do.

He has earnestly sought genuine economies in government without affecting vital services, trying to reach the 10 per cent cut in the general fund he promised during his campaign.

He also has proposed meaningful changes in administration and its habits that will make state government more responsive to the will of the people, also a campaign promise.

In short, the remarkable aspect of the first 100 days of the Reagan administration is that he has made a good start in changing the entire attitude of state government, even as he has sought the correction of deficiencies.

The impact this has had from the entrenched interests is not surprising, but even this is salutary. Without the impact, the governor could not have received the undivided attention of the vested interests to let them know he means business.

And in spite of the outcry in some quarters, the governor has turned the runaway trend of state government with grace, equanimity and logic—gaining national attention in the process, for if Gov. Reagan turns the tide of bureaucracy in California, other states will follow.

To persons who voted for the governor and now are seeing their wishes followed, or to his loyal opposition which will benefit in spite of itself, the first 100 Reagan days are encouraging.

With the hundreds more to come the job might get done.

IN DEFENSE OF THE FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other Members of this House who are supporting passage of legislation which would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the flag of our country. I offer this bill to demonstrate my support.

Mutilation of the flag is not—by any possible stretch of the imagination—a legitimate form of protest. It is, to my mind, disgraceful, unforgivable behavior that borders closely on treason.

The burning of our flag, such as has taken place on several occasions recently, is a direct assault upon all of the principles and values which we as Americans have come to cherish as a part of our national heritage. It is a direct insult to this Nation—to all of us who live under its flag—and especially to the memory of those who have given their lives in its defense.

It is a sad commentary upon the spirit of our times that such a law should be necessary, but necessary it is. If respect for our country and our flag must be enforced by the threat of fine and imprisonment, then I am prepared to impose such a threat. That respect is due. It must be forthcoming.

A BILL TO PROVIDE CAREER INCENTIVES FOR CERTAIN PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, to foster the very best of professional services for our members of the Armed Forces I would like to call attention to H.R. 794, sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], a bill now pending before the House Armed Services Committee to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces. In my district I am constantly aware of the need for the professionally trained officer. Bethesda Naval Hospital and nearby Walter Reed are but two of the facilities that require this highly trained personnel. It is imperative to attract and retain the professionally trained individual in the Armed Forces. The purpose of H.R. 794 is to authorize constructive service credit for payment purposes for officers of the Armed Forces whose original appointments are conditioned upon the possession of advanced degrees. No more than 3 years of such credit would be given in any case. The effect of the proposed legislation would be to equalize the constructive service credit given to veterinarians, lawyers, chaplains, and certain medical corps officers with that now given to doctors and dentists. The Department of Defense acknowledges the

need to recognize the advanced degree education of officers whose special knowledge is of vital importance to defense missions.

An officer who obtains professional or graduate education beyond the normal 4-year undergraduate level usually enters military service from 1 to 3 years later than his college contemporary who obtains only the basic baccalaureate degree. Since he has less active service, he is entitled under present law to less pay than his college contemporary, even if they both have the same military grade. Thus, although the Armed Force of which he is a member both requires and receives the benefit of his professional or graduate training, he is, in effect, penalized for the time spent in obtaining additional education.

The proposed legislation would eliminate this penalty and thereby encourage a greater number of professionally trained officers to remain in the Armed Forces on a career basis, under certain limited circumstances, various officers who required professional training are today given constructive credit for initial appointment in a grade higher than their line contemporaries. This credit, however, with the exception of physicians and dentists, is limited. To correct this inequity, I am, therefore, joining my colleagues in requesting that this bill be reported favorably out of the House Armed Services Committee, and passed by the House of Representatives and on through the Senate. I do hope my honorable colleagues join me in this action.

VIETNAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the majority of the American people who have been shielded from the untold barbarous and criminal acts inflicted by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong against innocent people, I am certain that recent newsphotos showing captured American fliers being paraded through the streets of Hanoi came as a profound shock.

While I applaud the swift and certain reaction by our State Department against this atrocity, it is clearly evident that a note of protest is not going to curtail this inhumane treatment so indicative of our enemy. I have said before, and I say again today the only way to deal with these people is to show them that we mean business. To these agents of deceit the Geneva Convention is only a means toward an end. To them, international commitments are only made to give an air of legitimacy to their aggression. Like their Chinese Communist compatriots in Korea 15 years ago, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have no respect for the rights of prisoners under article 13 of the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention.

Our retribution must be harsh and should include a blueprint for the total

destruction of all military and strategic installations in North Vietnam. It is all too obvious that these people are convinced we are a paper tiger. We have displayed courtesy—and, in reality, timidity—in our objective of limited bombing of the North. Certainly the inhumane treatment given these airmen should command our maximum support for our men in Vietnam and strengthen our determination to make the necessary military commitments to bring this war to a quick conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that any normal American would react with horror when he views the mistreatment of a fellow American by these Communist bandits. Such a feeling is intensified when we see one of the prisoners with a head wound and obviously suffering great physical pain. But, this scene and many others will be duplicated unless the go-ahead is given to our military leaders to prosecute this war as they see fit. We have been engulfed in the wraps of rhetoric too long. Too long has Vietnam been treated as a political war. The only way to bring the Communists to the negotiating table is through a position of strength. Notes of protest would not get the job done, but the destruction of every target of military importance in North Vietnam will.

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, literally thousands of people in the Washington area have been victimized by the activities of a few businesses allowed to operate here under names such as "debt adjusters," "budget counselors," "budget planners," or "credit advisers."

The victims, often people with good credit ratings and reasonably good incomes, but facing unusual emergency financial situations, have responded to carefully worded and deliberately misleading advertisements, and have contracted to pay set amounts of money on a periodic basis to "adjusters" who, in turn, attempted to obtain from their creditors agreement to accept reduced payments paid through the adjusters.

Misleading advertising has convinced many victims that their debts were being paid in full by the adjusters and that they, in turn, were to pay the adjusters a commission plus the balance of the debts on a regular basis. However, the adjusters do not actually make lump sum payments to creditors, but simply notify creditors that they will pay specific amounts in behalf of their clients until the debts are satisfied. The adjusters' commissions, deducted from the debtors' payments, are often sizable, and many debtors have found themselves facing repossession of their automobiles and garnishment of their

wages by creditors who refuse to deal with so-called debt adjusters.

As early as 1956 the State legislature in my own State of Virginia decided that the business of debt adjusting defied regulation and must be outlawed. I believe it has been now prohibited in some 20 other States as well.

In 1957, I introduced legislation which would have outlawed debt adjusting in the District of Columbia. However, a smoke screen, promoted by the adjusters themselves, was built up around the old argument of regulation as opposed to prohibition, and enough confusion was generated that the measure was amended and later died.

Since then, however, enough time has passed that we have been able to accumulate evidence which should convince anyone that the protection of the public desperately requires outlawing rather than regulating commercial debt adjusters here. The bill I am introducing today for this purpose will prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association.

I believe this legislation is long overdue, and I urge favorable consideration by my colleagues.

HON. MENDEL L. RIVERS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Honorable MENDEL L. RIVERS, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee upon which I serve, for the good work that he performs on behalf of our Nation and for his work put forth, and his efforts in behalf of H.R. 9240 which is now before this body. It is most urgent that this bill be passed in order to supply the needs of our Armed Forces throughout the world but more particularly in South Vietnam. I encourage each of my colleagues to give it a vote of confidence.

I wish to join Chairman RIVERS and Mr. HÉBERT, my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, in their remarks regarding the beatniks and so-called peace marchers who are in this city even on this very day, and who have the uncommon lack of good judgment to take this means to abuse freedom of speech and to heap untold harm upon our boys who are fighting in Vietnam.

It is indeed regrettable that the Department of Justice has the authority, capability, and the reinforcement of law to prosecute these demonstrators and yet refuses to do so. It is incumbent upon this body to urge, in every way possible, that the Department of Justice move quickly to deal properly with the responsibility that lies before it and correct this prostitution of justice.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the Nike X program, and the installation of this kind of antiballistic missile system. However, a great deal of money has already been spent in research and development in this area and it is my strong belief that continued research and development is absolutely necessary in order that we may have a ready deployment of these missiles which would be a useful first step toward meeting the defense needs of our Nation, and protect our citizens against ballistic missile attack from any present or future hostile Nation.

The appropriations reported by our committee in the amount of \$14,129,400,000 for procurement by all of our services of the necessary aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and track combat vehicles, of course, is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of our national defense posture worldwide and in our commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

I further urge this body to support the necessary and mandatory request of our services for further research, development, testing, and evaluation of our other defense systems in the amount of \$7,305,632,000.

Mr. Speaker, in a day when we have witnessed the deplorable conduct of some American citizens both at home and abroad who have openly desecrated our flag, and have criticized our soldiers for their involvement in a war to which our Nation is committed, this body is bound to condemn them for their acts and rally to the support of our fighting services with all that is necessary.

I urge support of this measure.

REPORT ON THE SPRING MEETING OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, as leader of the U.S. group I wish at this time to report on the spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union which was held at Palma de Mallorca on the island of Mallorca from March 27 to April 2, 1967.

The spring conference is the meeting at which the agenda and resolutions are prepared for the plenary session which this year will be held in Moscow, September 7-15. The U.S. group was composed of the following:

Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican of New York, president.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, vice president.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, vice president.

Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana, vice president.

Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut, member of the Interparliamentary Union Executive Committee and Interparliamentary Union Council.

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, member of the Interparliamentary Union Council.

Representative PAUL C. JONES, Democrat, of Missouri, treasurer.

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, secretary.

Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois.

Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington.

Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

Honorable Katharine St. George, executive secretary and honorary member of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the entire delegation for their fine cooperation and outstanding participation at the meeting. They were faithful to their assignments and worked untiringly throughout the sessions. Not only were they effective in the debate but also in the personal contacts which are a most important aspect of such a conference.

We met each morning in a group prior to the official sessions. This enabled us to keep in touch with the activities of the several committees and to review the problems presented. These preliminary discussions contributed valuable preparation for the final tests. In fact, this approach worked so satisfactorily that regular monthly meetings of the group will be held here in Washington to follow up the work undertaken at Palma. This will keep everyone currently informed on all activities of the Union as reported by the Secretariat in Geneva.

At the first morning session of the U.S. group in Palma we had a briefing by our Ambassador to Spain, Angier Biddle Duke. The Ambassador gave the delegates a good statement on political and economic conditions in Spain.

We then went to the first session of our conference, where we were greeted by the mayor of Palma, members of the Spanish Cabinet, and the head of the Spanish delegation, Conde de Mayalde. Our delegation was particularly happy to renew our friendships with many members of the Spanish delegation, especially with Senor Manuel de Arangué, who has always been such a good friend of the United States.

At these spring meetings, we receive proposals from the various international groups and the committees as to the resolutions to be brought before the

plenary sessions of the Interparliamentary Union Conference next fall. Our members on the five study commissions were as follows:

Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament.

Congressmen PIRNIE and DADDARIO; Senators SPARKMAN and BENNETT.

Economic and Social.

Congressmen POAGE and MAY; Senator JORDAN.

Parliamentary and Juridical.

Senators SCOTT and HART; Congressman ADAIR.

Non-Self-Governing Territories, and Ethnic Questions.

Congressman DERWINSKI, Senator KUCHEL, and Congressman JONES.

Cultural.

Senators ALLOTT and YARBOROUGH; Congressmen MCCLORY and MONAGAN.

During the conference, I was named a vice president of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament.

As anticipated, the debate in the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament centered on Vietnam. The agenda item embraced measures for insuring, in particular at the parliamentary level, the implementation of the United Nations declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of states and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. The Soviet Union, supported by other members of the Communist bloc, attacked the United States for its actions in Vietnam and offered a resolution which made specific charges against us. Senator SPARKMAN and I restated our position in support of self-determination for all nations and our desire to terminate the Vietnam struggle under terms assuring stability in that area, and protection against all forms of aggression, including terrorism and subversion. Other speakers affirmed their faith in our intentions.

Finally the problem was referred to a drafting committee composed of representatives of the U.S.S.R., Belgium, the United Arab Republic, Japan, and the United States. As a member of the Committee, I was very pleased that the resolution as reported dealt objectively with the real dangers of all forms of aggression, devoid of propaganda and specific charges. We joined with 27 nations in approving the resolution and the Soviets could only command 10 votes in opposition. Thirteen nations abstained. The full text of the resolution is appended to this report, together with the remarks of Senator SPARKMAN and myself.

The Economic and Social Committee passed a resolution that was acceptable to our three delegates after some revision; but it was decided to hold over the resolution, which dealt with the present international monetary system and its possible reform, for further study. Quite frankly, the delegates did not appear to be sufficiently informed to deal with this very specialized subject in such a short time.

The Cultural Committee accepted the U.S. resolution on parliament's role in the elaboration and control of national scientific policy, and named its author, Congressman MCCLORY, as rapporteur for the Committee. Representative Mc-

CLORY's remarks, and those of Senator ALLOTT, on this resolution and the work of this Committee are also part of this report.

In the same Cultural Committee, Senator ALLOTT proposed an excellent resolution on conservation, but it was decided to hold this matter over for further study. It was evident that the Senator's resolution was way ahead of anything that other delegations offered, as they specialized in only a few facets of the problem, whereas the Senator's report was much more inclusive:

The Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions, on March 30 and 31, resumed discussion of *Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism and New Forms of Racial, Religious, Political and Economic Discrimination* which it had begun in Teheran. Two separate tendencies came to light in the course of the debate, certain speakers stressing the virtual disappearance of colonialism in the world and the serious difficulties experienced by the newly independent countries, while others pointed out that the number of peoples under colonial domination was still considerable and denounced, in particular, the instances of neo-colonialism which manifested itself increasingly on the economic plane. The draft resolution, drawn up by the nine-member drafting committee and largely based on a text put forward by the French Inter-Parliamentary Group, takes these factors into account and stresses the economic aspect of the problem. With minor amendments, the draft was adopted unanimously by the full Committee. A summary of our position before this Committee may be found in the remarks of Congressman Derwinski hereto appended. In concluding debate he summarized the comments of other countries and rebutted hostile charges.

Finally, the Council met and accepted those resolutions noted above, which had affirmative committee action. In addition, the Council approved two significant resolutions introduced directly into its proceedings. One was a Belgian resolution on Vietnam which the U.S. group successfully amended in part before its approval by the Council for report to the Moscow Conference. The United States abstained from voting on the second resolution which was a proposal of the Polish delegation. Amended in two instances by the delegation from India, this resolution pertained to the nonproliferation of atomic weapons, and will probably come up for further discussion and possible amendment at the Plenary Session next fall.

On the whole we came out ahead on the deliberations at the conference, but it is well to remember that we are still fighting a rearguard action; and that we are not getting very much help from certain countries we assume to be our friends. For this reason we must be diligent in keeping abreast of everything that transpires, and consider carefully all communications from the Secretariat in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House will bear in mind that the Interparliamentary Union is the only group of international parliamentarians in the world; and that if the modern world does not support such a group in one of the world's largest democracies, the parliamentary form of government may well disappear from the earth.

Before I finish, I would also like to thank the staff which accompanied us

and extend our appreciation for its work and attention to detail. In addition to Mrs. St. George, our executive secretary, we had support from our administrative secretary, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate.

We were also helped by Dr. Charles Zinn, of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, by Mr. William H. Gleysteen, of the Department of State, and by Miss Milrae Jensen, of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate.

Our military escorts were Lt. Col. William Parker, USA; Lt. Col. Richard Guertin, USA; Lt. Col. Anthony DiLorenzo, USA (MC); Sgt. James J. Furey, USA; and Sgt. James Buchanan, USA.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include copies of the speeches made at Palma in the RECORD following my remarks, and that copies of the resolutions to be debated at the Moscow meeting in September also be included.

OPENING STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER PIRNIE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL QUESTIONS, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND DISARMAMENT, PALMA DE MALLOCA, MARCH 28, 1967

It is a great pleasure for the United States Delegation to meet once again as members of this international body—and, I should add, to be able to meet on this beautiful island. Each of our groups has major responsibilities within its own country to help assure conditions for constructive growth. Our task here should be to extend these national efforts into international relations. I hope we can use this meeting to increase our mutual understanding, because I am convinced there can be no sound basis for international peace and security without such understanding.

The need for our joint efforts should be apparent from a brief review of our progress and continuing problems. Helpful changes have taken place since the end of World War II and the bitterest days of the cold war. Mutual abhorrence of nuclear war now helps sustain an uneasy military balance among the major powers despite the tragedy of local wars. The confrontations of the 1950's have been altered as a result of national revivals in Europe and Asia, the virtual disappearance of former colonial systems, and the emergence of so many newly independent states.

The United States welcomes these changes. We seek the greater security which can come with growing maturity and confidence, even between nations with opposed ideologies. We have tried to adjust our policies to these new circumstances and to demonstrate appropriate flexibilities.

We have promoted a variety of contacts with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe;

We have joined in a limited test ban treaty;

We are in the process of achieving a new treaty for peaceful uses of outer space.

We are seeking an agreement which will help control the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We must not, however, let the encouragement of these trends obscure the vast area of unsolved problems. Communist China's militant leadership still pushes an enormous portion of mankind toward extreme goals creating unrest and turmoil within the country, severely threatening international efforts to stabilize the security of southern and eastern Asia. An ugly war continues in Vietnam. Korea remains divided. Improved relations in Europe have not opened a way to early unification of Germany. Tensions and periodic violence remain chronic in the Near East. A new range of problems has developed in Africa. And finally the vast ma-

jority of countries in the world remain in great need of assistance.

I know that many of you share my delegation's anxiety about the war in Vietnam. Our basic purpose there is simply to ensure that the people of Vietnam have the opportunity to work out their own future free from external attack—whether that attack be open and direct or covert and indirect. We seek nothing more. We do not threaten the legitimate interests of any other country in the area. We are not bent on imposing our own will in Vietnam, or intervening in the affairs of the Vietnamese people. We do not desire permanent military bases in South Vietnam.

Our determination to meet our commitments and resist aggression in Vietnam stems from our past experience and the world conflagration which resulted from previous failure to meet aggression. Anyone familiar with the United States role in this century knows that our people and government fervently desire the maintenance of a world order based on peace, progress, justice, and stability. We have sought most vigorously a peaceful settlement which would protect and preserve the legitimate interests of the people of both North and South Vietnam. Our record in seeking an honorable solution speaks for itself. We have repeatedly offered to go anywhere, at any time, meet with anyone, if doing so would advance the cause of peace in Vietnam. We are prepared to discuss all reasonable proposals. We have said we will engage in discussions without preconditions or undertake reciprocal actions leading to a cessation of hostilities. To this end we have used all responsible channels known to us, but up to this time have found no constructive response from the other side.

We have made clear our preference to use our resources to assist efforts of Asians themselves in the field of economic and social development. We have invited the Soviet Union and North Vietnam to participate with us and others, once peace is restored, in this cooperative venture on behalf of all people.

Although the war has enormously complicated steps toward national construction in South Vietnam, much progress has been made. A new constitution has been drawn up. Local elections will be held within the next few weeks and national elections will be held within a few months. Equally important, the Government of South Vietnam has undertaken measures of national conciliation in hopes of a situation where no elements of South Vietnam will be excluded from peaceful participation in their nation's political life.

In conclusion, my delegation believes there are specific steps which this body can usefully undertake whether we are dealing with the question of war in Vietnam or with other cases where we must concern ourselves with protecting states from outside intervention:

First, we can alert all nations, through study and debate, to the danger of intervention and its many forms;

Second, the IPU may call on national parliaments to search for ways to strengthen the capacity of their own nations for individual or collective self defense against attempted intervention;

And, finally, the IPU may encourage individual parliamentarians to study the problem of intervention.

If words about intervention can be translated into action to ensure non-intervention, then ideologies should be able to compete peacefully on their merits without endangering world peace.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL QUESTIONS, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND DISARMAMENT, PALMA DE MALLORCA, MARCH 28, 1967

I regret the attempt to make this debate serve propagandistic ends.

I also regret the invectives which have been used to heat this debate.

Above all, I regret that a few delegations have, in their presentations, chosen to ignore the dangers of the modern techniques of intervention. All of us here can, of course, agree to condemn open armed invasion. There have been a few cases of it in the last two decades—in Korea, Tibet, and Hungary, for example. Still open invasion has gone a little out of style. Most threats to the peace in the last few years have come from the equally vicious but slightly more subtle forms of intervention—such as terrorism, subversion, and support of the so-called "wars of national liberation."

The United Nations has long since condemned these forms of malicious intervention along with all the others. I leave it to my colleagues to judge the intentions of the Communist states in omitting subversion, infiltration, and terrorism from their state-ments and positions. Whatever the motives, I trust this organization, like the United Nations, will rectify the oversight.

My own conclusion, unfortunately, is that the Soviet Union and a few other states view debate on this topic not as an opportunity for serious work but as another chance to attack the United States for its support of the Government of South Vietnam. The Soviet Union always seems more prepared to talk about the Vietnamese situation than to do anything to end the war.

Although my delegation has already discussed the problem of Viet-Nam, concern for the truth and the integrity of the record requires me briefly to state the facts again. The action of the United States in Viet-Nam has been in response to aggression by North Viet-Nam against South Viet-Nam. The response of the United States to the requests of South Viet-Nam is an act of collective self-defense as perceived in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Further, the United States has offered time and again to enter into negotiations, without preconditions, for a settlement of the Viet-Nam conflict.

What is so disturbing about the repeated attacks made by the Soviet Union is the unspoken assumption that this body is so glib that it can be made victim to the philosophy that if you repeat a story long enough, no matter how untrue, people will begin to believe it. And, at the same time, the U.S.S.R. has obstructed action in the United Nations Security Council—a body competent to do something besides talk about Viet-Nam. The nation that has wept the biggest tears in this debate is one of the nations that has prevented action by the United Nations. Nor has that member's ally, North Viet-Nam, been prepared to talk privately about peace.

The United States, for its part, has continually stressed its willingness to negotiate. And my country will continue to strive for peace. We are, however, a little tired of getting in reply the same sterile invective and the same refusal to engage in serious work. We are tired of hearing pious thoughts for peace and witnessing contradictory actions.

I appeal now to the Soviet Union, and to any other nations who may be able to influence the North Vietnamese regime, to use their influence to bring about negotiations for peace—unconditional negotiations based on the principles of the Geneva Agreements.

Let me turn to the task before us: the task of drafting a resolution which will guide parliamentarians of all nations in the task of defining and combating intervention. This task is no longer so straightforward as it might have been a few decades ago. The problem is that intervention of one state in the affairs of another no longer invariably takes the simple form it had in past times. More common than direct invasion have been attempts to overthrow free and independent governments in the developing countries through assistance to so-called "national liberation movements." Such assistance has taken the form of arms, money,

and training. We saw it in Greece in the years after World War II. The Governments of Venezuela and Guatemala have fought this sort of intervention for years and are still doing so. In the case of Southeast Asia, the intervention has gone a step further. South Viet-Nam has long been subject to massive infiltration of enemy troops. Laos is the victim of the same aggression, and now it is beginning in Thailand. In these circumstances, it is important for this body to make clear that it condemns conquest, aggression, and intervention by any name. The action we are debating must be specific on this point.

Our task this year is given special urgency and importance because, last January, an organization was set up with the specific purpose of developing communist plans for intervention and making arrangements to carry them out. I refer to the Havana Tri-Continental Conference and the organization it established. The Tri-Continental Conference specifically attacked the United Nations and went on to make recommendations that are directly opposed to the UN Charter in every important particular. Every sort of intervention was justified and recommended to further "national liberation"—which is to say communist subjugation.

The Tri-Continental Conference and its permanent organizations have encouraged subversion and guerrilla warfare in a great many of the newly independent members of this organization. In Africa, some of the countries attacked have been Uganda, Congo (Kinshasa), Nigeria, Senegal, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Niger, Ivory Coast, Malagasy, Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, Rwanda, Botswana, and the present regime of Ghana. In Asia the Conference urged subversion in Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Laos, South Viet-Nam, Indonesia, and the Republic of China. In the Western Hemisphere, the list is too long to repeat, for it includes twenty-one independent states—Virtually the entire Hemisphere with the exception, of course, of Communist Cuba.

I would also note that the Havana Conference had high-level delegations of officials from every Communist country, but that with few exceptions its delegates from other countries were drawn from subversive groups or "liberation movements" engaged in open warfare with the governments of those independent countries. In my view, this body must make clear that it condemns such intervention by a few in the affairs of a great many.

I often wish that the nations guilty of fomenting such intervention would pay a little more attention to their own doctrine.

If the Communists really believe that every free people will of their own choice pick communism then I wish the salesmen for communism would throw away their guns. Let the people decide and decide freely. That is how to bring about peace. That is the way to insure that intervention, no matter what its form, will become a curiosity of history.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. DERWINSKI BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES AND ETHNIC QUESTIONS, MARCH 31, 1967, AT PALMA DE MALLORCA

The various resolutions before the Committee dealing with "neo-colonialism" require clarification since the term itself is subject to different definitions. We must first make clear that "neo-colonialism" is a term which the Communist nations use extensively in their propaganda which is directed at the economic philosophy and policies of Western nations who have freedom of economic activities not practiced behind the Iron Curtain.

The UAR, whose delegation seems determined to join in hurling criticism at Western nations, labeling them as imperialists, is itself a potential victim of "neo-colonialism" practices by the Soviet Union. The UAR

must fully recognize that the economic potential of its recently-discovered oil resources would be frustrated if the sales it would look forward to generating would be victimized by Soviet oil-dumping policies.

Our colleague from the USSR surprised me in that his presentation didn't reflect any change in substance from those utterances we have heard at previous conferences. I am afraid that the USSR and the other self-styled peoples' democracies are demonstrating their use of old clichés rather than providing practical suggestions as to how to advance world economic progress which would include betterment of conditions in developing lands.

In response to the commentary of the Hungarian spokesman, criticizing that the U.S. receives cooperation from South Africa in the aggression which the Communists claim we are waging in Vietnam, I must point out to them that it is the Communist North which is attacking the non-Communist South Vietnamese. However, it is the height of irony for a Hungarian Parliamentarian to profess to be interested in the rights of individual citizens of Aden or South Africa when his own government deprives its people of religious freedom. If the Hungarian government wishes to demonstrate its legitimate respect for human rights, it should permit Cardinal Mindszenty to return to his pastoral duties.

I must address myself in a very personal way to our committee member from Poland, who like his Soviet counterpart, attacked the U.S. in the standard Communist propaganda fashion. As an American of Polish extraction, I am proud of the land of my forebears, but must recognize that the present government in Warsaw is certainly not following the great traditions of freedom that can be seen in the history of the Polish nation. I recognize that the presence of Soviet troops on Polish soil might force the Warsaw government to take certain positions and I am hopeful that at future conferences we will discuss this type of "neo-colonialism" as well as the continued Soviet control of the Baltic States, Armenia, The Ukraine, and other captive nations held in colonial-type bondage.

However, the main assignment of our committee should not be to indulge in criticism of other nations, but to produce a workable resolution. On behalf of the U.S. group which includes my colleagues, Senator Kuchel and Representative Jones, I suggest that the draft resolution submitted by the French be the basis for refinement by a special committee and that emphasis be placed on legitimate logical plans for economic cooperation. No nation or any people will benefit from propaganda harangues or emotional disregard for the facts of life of international economics.

[The final resolution of the committee cleared up most of the objections which our delegation had, but since reference was still made to "neo colonialist" policies we did not support the final draft. Senator Kuchel proposed amendments which cleared up some of the language so that the final draft was as reasonable as we could have expected.]

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT MCCLORY
BEFORE THE CULTURAL COMMITTEE AT PALMA
DE MALLORCA, MARCH 29, 1967

It is most significant that a discussion on the vital subject of national science policy should occur in the homeland of our distinguished chairman, Senor Manuel de Arangui. For whatever else may be said of this conference, there can be no doubt about the vital role which the nations' parliaments must play in developing science policy for their respective nations. It is also obvious that the interchange of scientific knowledge and information between the nations of the world can be a most useful activity in behalf of greater international understanding and peace. Of course, it is essential that such knowledge and information should be ap-

plied for improving the economic and social condition of all of the peoples of the world.

The expressions "science" and "science policy" should be given the broadest interpretation possible to include science in all its branches, both basic and applied, and to include all of the various technological and other related disciplines which may be employed in our modern society.

The universal interest in this subject is apparent when we realize that a definitive and comprehensive science policy is a vital element in the programs of developing and developed countries alike. In addition to the universal application of the subject before the committee, our discussion of the role of parliament in the development of national science policy is intimately related to the important work of UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization) with which this committee has established close liaison.

In my own country, the United States Congress (parliament) has attached increasing importance to science policy in recent years. I might say, in passing, that in 1946 only approximately 1 percent of the national budget related to research and development on scientific and technological subjects. This figure has increased so that in 1965 an amount in excess of 15 percent of the national budget was allocated for scientific and technological purposes. On the basis of current national expenditures, this amounts to something more than \$15-billion annually.

The emphasis has been not solely that of the national government itself. The 50 states and lesser units of government have also devoted increasing amounts of their annual budgets to scientific uses. What to many seems of equal or perhaps greater significance is the allocation by private industry of sizable amounts of capital and earnings for scientific and technological research and development. In general, this results in improvements in the industry's processes and products. Frequently these private expenditures also result in substantial public benefits.

The role of Congress has expanded as this public and private emphasis on science and technology has increased. For instance, the Congress has supported and encouraged coordination of scientific activities in the executive departments and agencies of the government. More significantly, the Congress has established a Committee on Science and Astronautics, in which is included a Subcommittee of Science Research and Development. This subcommittee is headed by my colleague, Congressman Emilio Daddario, member of the United States delegation, and also a member of the Executive Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

The principal aim of this subcommittee has been to provide improved scientific information for the Members of the United States House of Representatives. The essential character of this subcommittee is apparent when one considers that the Congress must make expensive and vital decisions with respect to those areas of scientific research and development which it elects to authorize and finance.

In addition to the scientific information available through those scientists attached to the executive branch of the government, as well as those in educational institutions and private industry, the Congress has provided an independent source of scientific information in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

At the inaugural ceremonies of the new headquarters of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Geneva in November 1965, Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., presented a paper entitled, "Information required by Members of Parliament in a World Increasingly Governed by Science." Dr. Wenk's presentation was reproduced in a special issue of the Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin (First Quarter 1966). In

concluding his remarks, Dr. Wenk declared significantly:

"... in a representative government, Parliaments must be not only recipients of science-based information; Parliaments must also be the sources of information and interpretation—to illuminate the issues and alternatives before the nation so as to be sure that there is adequate exchange with their constituency for parliamentary action indeed to be the 'people's choice.'" (p. 39)

What is, I believe, a unique practice inaugurated by Congressman Daddario's subcommittee is the convening of an annual symposium to which leaders in the various categories of science from various parts of the world are drawn together to exchange ideas and to share information with representatives of the Congress and their staffs. These scientific experts are drawn from government, institutions of higher learning and the private sector.

We were privileged during this most recent symposium, which was held in January of this year, to have as a participant our distinguished Secretary General, M. André de Blonay. In the course of his remarks, M. de Blonay appraised this particular work of the United States Congress in part as follows:

"My first comment is that the U.S. Congress is to my knowledge—and I know a great many parliaments in all parts of the world—the only assembly where a seminar of this type can take place providing for a free exchange of ideas and information between political leaders, on the one hand, and qualified representatives of the scientific community, both national and international, on the other.

"... the integration of science and politics (is) a prerequisite for any nation which wishes to develop and to implement an integrated national science policy corresponding to the needs of its people."

I suppose the main significance of this discussion of the United States science policy is that the role of Congress has grown dramatically in order to meet its responsibilities to the people whom the various Members of Congress represent. Also, it seems important to point out that in the American parliamentary system the minority party is given appropriate recognition. Decisions with regard to science policy, including authorizations and appropriations, reflect many of the views of the Members of the minority party in the Congress. I should add, also, that in searching out the best and most current scientific information and advice, Members of the Congress frequently hear from scientists who expound divergent points of view.

In endeavoring to abbreviate these remarks and point to the broad objectives of my nation's science policy as I believe it exists, and to provide a consensus or cross-section of the views of the 535 Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, I would like to suggest the following as our nation's main objectives:

- 1) Congress is anxious to obtain the maximum benefit from scientific and technological advances and to support those activities which are the most productive in benefiting the nation.
- 2) Congress favors the greatest possible coordination between various scientific research agencies and endeavors to prevent as much overlapping of activities as possible.
- 3) Congress undertakes to promote interest in science and technology and to encourage among the general public the benefits which flow from these developments.
- 4) Congress endeavors to encourage its citizens to engage in basic and applied scientific research and to utilize scientific and technological developments.
- 5) Congress also encourages a maximum of cooperation and interchange between the scientists from the private and public sectors, and advocates a maximum dissemination of scientific and technological information.

tion. It is the feeling of the Congress that by promoting this sort of cooperation, we can gain greater international understanding and promote universal well-being—and peace.

As our distinguished Secretary General declared at the recent United States Congressional Symposium on Science:

"There was one * * * point on which our members meeting in Paris agreed and this was that the universal nature of science implies that every state, when formulating its science policy, must take into account the imperative requirements of international cooperation and solidarity.

"* * * Yes, science is universal. Its language ignores national barriers. Science in an interdependent world can only develop through the free flow of talent and ideas and scientists probably form the only true international community whose members share common values and have a common understanding of their objectives in the search for truth.

"The concept of world peace through world law, on which great hopes were placed in the past, has not made much progress. We now look to scientists, hoping that they will make their contribution to world peace in this great tradition of scientific humanism * * *"

I conclude by stating, that, in my opinion, the attainment of these objectives by parliamentarians from all countries could help move the people of the world rapidly toward a goal of friendly and cooperative understanding and universal peace.

May I add that the approval of a draft resolution for appropriate discussion or debate at the September meeting in Moscow would seem to be a most important step for this Committee.

ADDENDUM TO REMARKS BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT BEFORE THE CULTURE COMMITTEE AT PALMA DE MALLORCA, MARCH 27-APRIL 2, 1967

At the Spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union meeting, which was held at Palma de Mallorca from March 27-April 2, I was assigned to the Cultural Committee, upon which Representative Robert McClory has served for a considerable length of time.

At a preliminary meeting of our Committee, held in the Capitol, we determined that he would handle the first area of discussion assigned to the Cultural Committee, which was basically the subject of the application of Science and Technology in our expanding world and the dependence of developing countries.

Mr. McClory did a very fine job of presenting this area to the Cultural Committee and drew a draft resolution which was adopted with only minor modifications and presented to the Council.

The second portion of the Cultural Committee assignment was the world-wide problem of the conservation of nature and natural resources. The very title left the whole area to be covered quite undefined because as Mr. John Kenneth Rose of the Library of Congress pointed out in the paper prepared for the use of the Delegation, the term "conservation of nature" is not commonly used in the United States. We were not certain, therefore, whether the subject matter to be covered was the "preservation of nature" or the conservation and use of all natural resources of a country, including timber, ore, water, hydro-electric potential, soil and the many other uses deriving from the multiple purpose concept which has been enacted into law by the United States Congress.

At the meeting of the Cultural Committee, upon this particular item, Senator Yarborough was also present and did not speak only because of the pressure of time from other delegates.

It appeared that the assignment of the subject matter had not been given sufficient

thought and definition. Some countries who made statements were not certain whether they should talk about "preservation of nature" or conservation of natural resources.

Statements were made by the delegates from Belgium, Israel and Germany, as well as Japan and the Netherlands, and demonstrated the confusion as to the area of discussion.

We had taken the precaution to draw a draft resolution, covering basically the two broad aspects of this problem as to the preservation of natural environments and the multi-purpose use of all the natural resources of the country.

I attach a copy of this resolution. It was filed with the Chairman of the Cultural Committee and action was diverted upon the basis that the Cultural Committee was to submit only one resolution to the Council and that the Science and Technology Resolution drawn by Mr. McClory was much more advanced in discussion. Action was diverted upon the Resource Resolution, but it was agreed it would be discussed at Moscow.

If I am in attendance in Moscow, I would suggest the submission of this Resolution as a source for discussion, but it is obvious that the Chairman of the Cultural Committee, or ourselves, will have to define the areas of discussion. Most persons who spoke were concerned with the preservation of natural environment and not with the conservation of multiple uses of all the natural resources of a country.

It would be my hope that Moscow would form a basis for defining some of these areas, where the great know-how of the United States could be of assistance to the developing countries in the great and broad area of the use of natural resources.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WORLD-WIDE PROBLEM OF THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Considering conservation to include both the preservation of nature and the wise use of natural resources, emphasizing development and management of resources to obtain and assure the greatest good for the largest number of people for the longest period of time;

Observing the continuing growth of population in most of the lands of the earth, the rising expectations of such populations and the expanding demands made by such populations upon natural resources;

Realizing the dependence of all mankind upon soil and water for food and fiber, conservation, development, rehabilitation, and augmentation of these vital resources must be universally encouraged, utilizing the most advanced and proven techniques which in some instances may require the joint efforts of two or more nations;

Believing that it is necessary for every State to formulate and implement conservation policies in harmony with the natural resources available to it, whether they be proven or potential supplies, as well as with its own present and hoped-for national development;

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the preservation of endangered species, the setting aside of unspoiled samples of the natural environment, the establishment of parks and monuments of unique character or beauty, the making available of sites, reserves, trails, wild rivers, green belts, open spaces, and other natural areas for use, recreation and study;

Recognizing also the basic dependence of our complex civilization on the development and wise use of land and soil, water, air, minerals, energy, forests, and other vital resources from which man supplies his needs for food, clothing and shelter as well as the sinews of modern industry;

Concerned that easily available supplies of some resources are being exploited at a rate which cannot be maintained, and that the quality of the environment, especially

of air and water, is being degraded by preventable pollution;

Recognizing furthermore the world-wide nature of some conservation problems, that international cooperation is necessarily involved if policies and programs are to be established and accomplished with respect to some resources and that mutual benefits are to be derived from international discussion of many aspects of most conservation problems;

Aware of efforts to promote natural resource surveys, encourage the formulation of conservation policy and the planning and activation of conservation projects by UNESCO, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology, and other international organizations;

Believing that it is the responsibility of Parliaments to help formulate and control national conservation policies and to ensure that advances thereunder are applied in the development of national economies:

1. *Notes with satisfaction* that Resolution 2173 (XXI) of the General Assembly, adopted on December 8, 1966, endorsed the continuing study by the Economic and Social Council of the means of implementing a five-year survey program for the development of non-agricultural resources, intended to strengthen the economic base and the economic independence of the developing countries.

2. *Urges* that such surveys be directed specifically to discovering and evaluating resources which now are or soon will be in short supply.

3. *Emphasizing* that such surveys are not an end in themselves but if oriented toward meeting an emerging need may provide an adequate base for feasible economic development.

4. *Notes, also with satisfaction* that UNESCO, in its General Conference, fourteenth session meeting in Paris in October-November 1966 adopted Resolution 2.23 which reaffirms that the Director-General is authorized to continue to take appropriate steps to stimulate research and training relating to the natural environment and resources of land areas and their conservation.

5. *Requests* that conservation of natural resources as encouraged by UNESCO and other international agencies will involve a broad rather than restricted definition of the field and its problems.

6. *Expresses hope* that the developed nations will continue to share their present knowledge and technologies with the developing nations for the benefit of all peoples, and continue the search for better ways and means and will cooperate in joint endeavors to develop, rehabilitate, and augment vital basic resources.

7. *Urges* all parliaments to ensure that national conservation policies, programs and activities are provided with the human, financial and material resources necessary for timely development and to establish the governmental bodies and institutions required for activating and coordinating national conservation policy, giving emphasis to education of the public as well as skilled technicians or research and development.

RESOLUTION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL QUESTIONS, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND DISARMAMENT ADOPTED BY THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MOSCOW MEETING CONCERNING MEASURES FOR ENSURING, IN PARTICULAR AT THE PARLIAMENTARY LEVEL, THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE INADMISSIBILITY OF INTERVENTION IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF STATES AND THE PROTECTION OF THEIR INDEPENDENCE AND SOVEREIGNTY

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Noting the great international significance of the Declaration adopted by the XXth Ses-

sion of the United Nations General Assembly on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,

Displaying serious concern over the fact that, despite the unanimous approval and adoption of the above-mentioned Declaration, some States continue armed intervention in the domestic affairs of other States in different parts of the world as well as carry on other forms of direct or indirect interference with the sovereign independence of other countries and nations, resulting in increased international tension and in threats to universal peace,

Expressing full support of the resolution adopted by the XXist Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Status of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,

Realizing the urgent need for adoption by Parliaments of concrete measures so as to achieve strict observance of the principles of the said Declaration,

Considers it its duty to call upon the Parliaments of all countries:

1. to facilitate, in all their foreign-policy activities, the strict implementation of the principles of the Declaration of the XXth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, as well as the Resolution on the course of the implementation of this Declaration adopted by the XXist Session of the United Nations General Assembly;

2. to strive for the immediate termination and continued avoidance of armed intervention or promotion or organization of subversion, terrorism or other indirect forms of intervention for the purpose of changing by violence the existing system in another State or interfering in civil strife in another State;

3. to oppose actively all actions directed towards interference in the domestic affairs of other States, particularly by open parliamentary discussions of such actions, by refusal to approve appropriations for carrying them out and by coming out against all other actions capable of hampering the unconditional application of the humane principles of non-intervention and national independence in the practice of international relations.

RESOLUTION FROM THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE ADOPTED BY THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MOSCOW MEETING CONCERNING METHODS OF ASSISTING DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN TRADE BY FIXING EQUITABLE AND STABLE PRICES FOR THEIR EXPORTED PRODUCTS AS WELL AS FOR GOODS IMPORTED BY THEM FROM INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Convinced that unrelaxed efforts are essential for normalizing and further developing trade and economic contacts directed towards accelerating economic and social progress and promoting mutual understanding among nations,

Recognizing that the recommendations adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the normalization of international trade reflect the progressive conception of international economic relations,

Convinced that "Principles governing international trade relations and trade policies conducive to development", adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, created the basis for normalizing international trade,

Considering that the deterioration in the terms of trade, that is to say the relation between the prices of exported and imported

goods, seriously impedes the economic progress of developing countries.

Supporting the ardent efforts of the developing countries to put an end to economic backwardness as quickly as possible and to build up an independent national economy,

Taking into account the need for encouraging the expansion and diversification of all trends in international trade, particularly the ensuring of the proper solution of urgent problems pertaining to trade and development of the developing countries,

Recognizing the need for further efforts in order to continue the work begun by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and to implement its Principles and recommendations,

Appeals to the Governments of all countries:

1. to mobilize the constructive efforts of their States for the speedy implementation of the decisions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

2. to support in every way measures to make the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development an effective instrument for normalizing international trade and its growth on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs of countries and mutual benefit;

3. to facilitate in every way the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, directed towards creating favourable conditions for increasing the export receipts of the developing countries.

RESOLUTION FROM THE CULTURAL COMMITTEE ADOPTED BY THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MOSCOW MEETING CONCERNING PARLIAMENT'S ROLE IN THE ELABORATION AND CONTROL OF NATIONAL SCIENCE POLICY

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Considering science to include not only the basic study of natural laws but also the application of this knowledge to the needs of mankind through development and engineering and other technology,

Observing the continually increasing importance of science in the life of all peoples and its essential role in economic development,

Recognizing the necessity for every State to set its own goals, to formulate and implement a science policy in harmony with its own national development, and to help itself towards the achievement of its goals,

Recognizing also the universal nature of science, the imperative necessity for international co-operation in many fields of science, and the mutual benefits to be derived from international co-operation in all scientific fields,

Aware of efforts to promote national science policy planning by Unesco, the Advisory Committee of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, and other international organizations and of the advantages of strengthening the relationship between the Union and Unesco in this area as well as in the other fields of common interest,

Believing that it is the responsibility of Parliaments to help formulate and control national science policies and to ensure that scientific advances are applied in the development of national economies and social progress,

1. Reaffirms the resolution adopted by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to Economic Development, drawing particular attention to the invitation to developing countries to establish organs and institutions for studying means of harnessing the national scientific and technological potential for the purpose of economic development;

2. Requests that Unesco continue its role in co-operation with other international

agencies to assist nations with science policy planning;

3. Expresses the hope that the developed nations will search for new ways to share the benefits of their scientific knowledge and capabilities with the developing nations for the maximum benefit of all the peoples of the world;

4. Urges all Parliaments to ensure that national scientific activities are provided with the human, financial and material resources necessary for their full development and to establish the governmental bodies and institutions required for the elaboration and co-ordinated implementation of national science policy, giving emphasis to education as well as to research and development;

5. Recommends that each Parliament take the initiative in defining the objectives of a national science policy which is responsive to its national needs and the guiding principles for achieving those objectives;

6. Recommends further that all parliamentarians be made aware of their new responsibilities in the sphere of science and technology;

7. Invites consideration by legislative assemblies of the following procedures to ensure that their new responsibilities in the field of science are fulfilled:

- (a) The establishment of standing parliamentary committees specially constituted for the examination of questions relating to science policy with the aim of helping to co-ordinate scientific activities and preventing duplication of effort without adversely affecting basic scientific research;

- (b) The provision to parliamentarians of access to all sources of information and the assistance necessary for debating questions regarding science policy with a full knowledge of the facts;

- (c) The creation of opportunities for exchanging ideas with qualified representatives of the scientific community drawn from industry and education and other independent sources as well as government;

- (d) The adoption of long-term and medium-range plans for scientific development, as well as functional budgets for scientific activities.

DECISION ADOPTED BY THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION COUNCIL AS AN APPEAL IN SUPPORT OF THE CONCLUSION OF A TREATY TO PREVENT THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The Inter-Parliamentary Council, Referring to point 3 of the resolution on "Methods of strengthening Regional Security in Conformity with the United Nations Charter", which was adopted unanimously by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Teheran,

Recalling UN General Assembly Resolution 2028/XX, of November 19, 1965, Resolution 2149/XXI, of November 4, 1966, and Resolution 2153/XXI, of November 17, 1966, concerning the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons,

Considering that the absence of an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons incurs the risk of an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons and in stocks of nuclear weapons, as well as their proliferation, and, consequently, is the source of an aggravation of international tension, constitutes a threat to world peace and increases the danger of a nuclear war,

Recalling the duty of Parliaments and Governments of all States to contribute towards the creation of favourable conditions for the conclusion of disarmament agreements,

Convinced that an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons would be a step forward in strengthening security and peace, and achieving general and particularly nuclear disarmament,

Urgently appeals to all Parliaments and Governments:

1. to use their influence and take the necessary measures to facilitate and accelerate the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons which would be acceptable to all States;

2. to refrain, until the conclusion of such a treaty, from any action liable to render its conclusion more difficult or which could lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world;

3. to use their influence towards achieving general and particularly nuclear disarmament.

COLONIALISM, NEO-COLONIALISM AND NEW FORMS OF RACIAL, RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION

DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT PALMA BY THE COMMITTEE ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES AND ETHNIC QUESTIONS, AND INCLUDED BY THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COUNCIL IN THE AGENDA OF THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE
Rapporteur: Mr. P. de Montesquiou (France)

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, *Recalling* its attachment to the basic principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and guaranteed by Article 55 of the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 1514 (XV),

Aware that respect of fundamental rights and freedoms is an integral element of the dignity of human beings, the violation of which, by acts of racial, national or religious intolerance, is liable seriously to compromise international security,

Deeply concerned that, despite the recent liberation of many peoples from colonialist rule, there remain a great number of human beings in certain parts of the world who are still under its yoke,

Deeply concerned, furthermore, at the maintenance and practice of racial discrimination in certain States which constitute a denial of the right of peoples to self-determination, in particular by the policy of apartheid,

Convinced that the efforts to promote human rights throughout the world are not sufficient to eliminate all forms of intolerance,

Noting that the gap between the industrialized and the developing nations is widening and that this constitutes one of the most urgent problems of the age which seriously hinders the establishment in the developing countries of effective freedoms based on the economic, social and cultural promotion of the individual,

1. *Condemns* violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they occur;

2. *Associates* itself with the work of the numerous international organizations preoccupied with these problems, particularly the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations;

3. *Invites* delegates to take action in their respective Parliaments to ensure the adoption of legislative measures which would promote absolute respect for human rights and the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on race, sex and religion, as well as of all propaganda designed for this purpose;

4. *Urges* them to increase their efforts for the acceleration of the process of decolonization of the still dependent territories on all continents, in keeping with the United Nations resolutions;

5. *Appeals* to National Groups to exert their influence to urge their Governments to co-operate with the United Nations without

delay by taking positive steps against violations of the territorial sovereignty of nations;

6. *Urgently requests* Governments:

(a) to seek a solution for alleviating the economic difficulties of developing nations resulting from the trade and economic conditions maintained by neo-colonialist policies;

(b) to support the work of the 1964 Geneva Conference on Trade and Development, especially regarding the state of world market prices for raw materials, the intensification of technical aid and investments of a productive character;

(c) to support the granting of aid through the intermediary of international organizations.

DECISION ADOPTED BY THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION COUNCIL FOR THE DISPATCH OF A DELEGATION FROM THE UNION TO NORTH AND TO SOUTH VIETNAM

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,
1. *Invites* its President to request the Governments of North and South Vietnam, as well as the National Liberation Front, whether they would be prepared to receive a delegation from the Union;

2. *Decides*, on condition that the agreement of all the interested parties is obtained, to dispatch a delegation from the Inter-Parliamentary Union, composed of its Executive Committee, to North and to South Vietnam so that it may discuss with all interested parties the possibilities of rapprochement, reconciliation and peace, offer the facilities and good offices of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for these purposes and report to the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to be held in Moscow from September 7 to 15, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express once more my well-deserved appreciation to those Members of this body who so effectively participated in this meeting.

I am sure that for all of us it was a great experience as we came in close contact with the parliamentarians of other nations and had an opportunity to review our thoughts with people who have become more than acquaintances and more than fellow parliamentarians, in becoming our personal friends.

I trust that the members of the delegation share with me the feeling that this was one of our most memorable experiences in conferences of this type.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to commend the gentleman from New York for his statement here today. I would call attention to his recommendation that the documents that will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not only reflect the work of the members of the Interparliamentary Union at the last meeting but contain some very worthwhile reading matter. I, too, want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of this House to these documents. They are well worth the reading.

I feel it is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, to call special attention to the fine work that the gentleman from New York, who is addressing us from the well in this Chamber, has done as president of our American delegation this year and as acting leader the last couple of years at these international meetings.

He has done his work so well and has attracted so much attention and so much

personal support from the delegations from other countries that he has been an honor and a credit to the United States. The gentleman has been a real tower of strength during the course of these hearings and as a result he has had the support of the American delegation to the fullest extent.

The work has been arduous. The activities have been important. The U.S. delegation has always had to watch very carefully the work it has done because, unfortunately, we are under attack for many reasons by many countries. The fact is, too, that we are looked to for leadership. We had the opportunity, such as on the committee which Mr. McCLOY represents, to draw attention to the importance of science and technology, and this rapidly expanding scientific and technology age in which we live, the way in which parliaments throughout the world must adjust and adapt themselves to scientific and technological developments.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed further, there is a very important development which I believe took place during the course of these meetings, namely, a legitimate peace attempt made through a resolution submitted by the Belgium group. This is one of the documents which the gentleman from New York will put on record, but it deserves specific attention particularly because during a time the United States is being chastised, as it has been at those meetings, and particularly charged with not making the necessary efforts to bring about peace through proper negotiations in Vietnam, the Belgium group submitted a resolution which offered that opportunity through the dispatch to North Vietnam and South Vietnam of members of its executive committee to use the Interparliamentary Union, representing some 70 nations throughout this world, for the purpose of putting its weight behind the bringing of this problem to the negotiation table for a peaceful solution.

The U.S. delegation supported that resolution after making some correcting amendments, and the record will show that during the course of that debate in every single instance the entire Communist bloc voted against those efforts. We were particularly proud of the support that the U.S. group gave to the Belgium declaration. It is, I believe, important that, during the course of this, we showed that the Members of Congress had objectivity, flexibility, and knowledge of the problem, and that they were doing everything possible to draw attention to the fact that, as a Nation, the United States placed no barriers in the path of peace.

The debate upon the Belgium resolution was one of the most important ones which took place at that meeting, and we would hope that, since it was a resolution favorably acted upon, despite the opposition of the so-called Communist bloc, with steps being taken at the moment so that an invitation might be obtained in order for the executive committee to carry out these responsibilities, that these efforts might be successful.

Again I thank the gentleman from

New York for yielding me this time. I congratulate him further for the fine work he has done, and I congratulate, too, the entire delegation which, under his leadership, accomplished such important actions at the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. PIRNIE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I thank him very much for his kind remarks, but his comments have been made with characteristic modesty because, in fact, he was the one who handled in the Council this very difficult question with respect to the Belgium resolution, and, by the changes he was able to develop, he made it acceptable in form so that it could be an intelligent appeal in behalf of the parliaments of the world to the respective parties to accept, if they will, the good offices of the Interparliamentary Union, with its headquarters in Geneva, so that there might be a meeting to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam situation.

There has now been brought before all the parliaments of the world our willingness and our eagerness to use to the fullest extent this method of arriving at a peaceful settlement. There remains no shred of justification for charging this Nation with aggressive intent.

I believe it was a powerful example of the type of leadership that can be given in this body and congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for the way in which this situation was finally resolved. Steps are now being taken to implement that resolution. They have already sent in behalf of the Union a notification to the respective governments of the passage of the resolution and offer of these services has been intended. We now can only await the result.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, an able member of the delegation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join those other members of the group who attended the spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union who have spoken and who will hereafter speak.

First of all, it was appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the leadership which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], who is now in the well, accorded our delegation. Its importance cannot be overstressed. With the number of committees meeting, with the several people present as members of the delegation, it was of the utmost importance that our efforts be closely synchronized and tied together. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New York, this was certainly done.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union are an illustration—I believe perhaps the best illustration—of a committee in which Members of both bodies of our Congress can meet and work jointly and closely together. Never was this more clearly demonstrated than in the meetings of this spring.

Previous speakers have indicated that the entire group were diligent in their efforts. I certainly subscribe to that statement. Members of both bodies of

this Congress worked diligently and hard in furthering the American position.

In these days when members of the executive branches of the governments throughout the world meet very frequently—and I believe generally quite effectively—it becomes more and more important that members of legislative bodies also meet together and have an opportunity to exchange views and to arrive at conclusions particularly reflecting the standpoint of the legislative body. This, to me, is one of the important things which these meetings of the Interparliamentary Union afford us an opportunity to accomplish.

I am sure that in the years ahead, increasingly—again under such leadership as we have had from the gentleman from New York—these meetings will continue to be effective and increase in their fruitfulness as we strive to find solutions for problems of national and international importance.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana. His experience, not only as a member of former delegations, but as a ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has brought to this work a wealth of knowledge that has been very earnestly applied. I thank him for his most effective participation in our work.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a veteran member of the delegation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Indiana.

I am sure they express the feeling of all of the delegates to this most recent conference as to the fine leadership that our body had.

I should like to speak particularly to those who possibly are not well acquainted with the objectives of the Interparliamentary Union as such and particularly to those who might be critical of groups from the Congress meeting with members of legislative bodies from the other nations of the world.

Having been identified with and having participated in these conferences over the past 12 years, I believe I have been in a position to observe not only the improvement we have been able to make in the manner in which our participation has taken place but also the benefits which have come to this Nation as a result of the opportunity of members of the American group to meet with members of groups from some 50 or 60 nations each year and to observe their operations and to have a better understanding of their motivation and also to recognize any feeling they might have for the United States—which has not always been good, as we all realize.

I know as an individual and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been able to return from these conferences with what I consider to be constructive suggestions about things we can do to improve the programs in which we have been engaged over the years.

I believe we have an opportunity to impress upon the representatives from these other nations the fact that here in

the United States we do have a system of government—which others have tried to pattern themselves after—that we actually practice. We have been able to impress upon the representatives from other nations the importance of the Congress, as the legislative body of our Government.

I have seen this improvement. I believe this money not only is well spent but is returned to the people of America manifold from the benefits we are able to bring back from these conferences, both the one held in the spring for the planning and the main conference in the fall.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his comments. I should like to say that the years he has served as a member of the delegation have afforded him a background against which to make these judgments. His faithfulness to the opportunity of making personal contacts and engaging in helpful conversations with members of other delegations has been particularly noted. I should like to commend him for the genuine friendships he has developed.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], the secretary of our group.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from New York in reporting to the House on the work of the U.S. delegation to the spring session of the Interparliamentary Union in Palma de Mallorca, Spain.

Necessary emphasis must be placed on the individual contacts that are developed with members of foreign parliaments at Interparliamentary Union meetings and the great potential that lies in the person-to-person relations which could develop with key officials in foreign lands. For example, a personal contact which I made at recent Interparliamentary Union meetings, the Honorable Luigi Turchi, Member of the Italian Parliament, was visiting in Washington last Wednesday and we renewed our association and discussed problems facing NATO in the light of the recent developments in Greece. Our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], in addition to our chairman, maintains numerous contacts of this nature. The Interparliamentary Union meetings present us with a great opportunity and an even greater responsibility of puncturing Communist propaganda attacks against the United States, demonstrating to participants from all over the world the vitality and effectiveness of our legislative branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I especially wish to emphasize the excellent coordination which has developed within our congressional delegation to the Interparliamentary Union meetings between Members of the House and Senate. This coordination has been demonstrated to a practical advantage in our preparation for debate at the conferences. The allocation of subject matter equips us to meet the "curve balls" continually hurled by delegates from the Communist bloc nations.

The basic purpose of the Interparliamentary Union is to advance parliamen-

tary or representative government. When we view the tendency to dictatorships or one-party governments in many lands, we know that it is essential that emphasis be placed on effective parliamentary governments representing the views of the people. Among the significant contributions our U.S. delegation makes at all of these meetings is the demonstration of the vitality of our legislative branch of Government, the spirit of our two-party structure, and the respect we maintain for the views of our respective political parties.

The United States, along with the British Commonwealth countries, sets an example in maintaining an effective parliamentary government, that if followed by emerging lands, would contribute to their stability and progress. In official discussions, as well as in unofficial conversations, we have an opportunity to explain the vitality of our free enterprise economic system, to discuss the foundations which have helped produce the greatness of our country, and give the assembled leaders from other nations an opportunity to understand the American way.

Mr. Speaker, I join the other members of our Interparliamentary Union Delegation in commending the gentleman from New York for his leadership.

I point out to the Members that even though we as Representatives of the U.S. Congress find that too many of our colleagues pay scant attention to this conference and our participation, most of the other nations find their participation to be one of their major undertakings. This is especially true with respect to the newly developing countries which are attempting to develop a thriving parliamentary government. To them an opportunity to participate in a world conference is something to which they attach significance.

So it is necessary for us to reemphasize to our colleagues what we feel is a valuable contribution we make on behalf of the citizens of the United States and the Congress of the United States, through this opportunity to explain, especially to delegates from the emerging countries, the vitality of our congressional structure, the freedom of our legislative branch of Government, and the bipartisanship with which we approach the major problems.

I especially wish to pay tribute to our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], who has been our spokesman this year in the executive committee and the Council and has done an excellent job not only in debate but in developing personal contacts that are needed to expand the influence of the United States and to protect us—and I use that word deliberately—from the propaganda that the Communist bloc continually develops.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. He has made a very good point when he stresses the opportunity for explaining what is really meant by our parliamentary system. We find all classifications of parliament within this group. Those who are just starting to attain some responsibility in the legislative branch marvel at the scope of the activities which we enjoy and the way in which

we initiate and develop legislation. Only through personal conversation have we been able to make this point clear.

It is interesting to note some of the delegations have seen fit to take advantage of our offer to come here and witness at close range the form of activity in which our committees engage and the procedures under which legislation is brought to the House.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York on organizing and making this report to the House and to the Congress, because certainly everyone should know the value of this work that is being done by our delegation with the Interparliamentary Union. Much is to be gained from spreading it upon the RECORD.

I was interested to read recently in a rather well-known book called "Washington Wife," which is a diary of the wife of a Texas Congressman named Ellen Slayden, who was writing at times in the Wilson administration and previously of trips to the Interparliamentary Union at that time. It was interesting to me to realize specifically that we had been sending delegations to the Interparliamentary Union for this period of time.

As the gentleman from New York has said, there are over 50 members who attended the last meeting and over 80 nations are members of this Interparliamentary Union. Although there has been some change in the objectives of the organization and in the means by which they are worked out since the time when it was founded in the 1880's, I certainly agree with what the gentleman has said as to the usefulness of the delegations from different countries getting together not only because of the formal agenda but also because of the opportunities that we have to talk with delegations and with individual members from other countries about some of the deep problems that apparently separate us. In many instances we find there are approaches that might not have been discovered otherwise.

I should like to refer just briefly to the commendations that the gentleman from New York and the American delegation received for the work that was done at Teheran, which was an outstanding job of defending the position of the United States, which resulted in a change in sentiment, I think, on the part of some countries and which resulted in very strong expressions of support. Certainly the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], in that meeting and also in the last meeting in Majorca performed yeoman service in presenting our point of view. And, clearly, in many instances it is a lack of knowledge and lack of information which causes differences between countries and which caused the differences which existed at this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, all of us had the opportunity to briefly explain some of the political phenomena in the United States and some of the reasons as to why we have reached the decisions at which we have arrived.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we can modestly say, but with confidence, that this delegation has contributed to a greater understanding between the nations represented and has contributed towards some substantial steps for a peaceful solution of the world's problems.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that no one has been more sensitive to the opportunity for advancing this understanding between our great country and the other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], drawing upon his day-to-day experiences in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, exhibited a depth of knowledge and interest which was very, very valuable. Above all, I would like to commend the gentleman for his faithfulness in carrying out every assignment and for his display of genuine interest throughout the conference.

Mr. Speaker, these traits which were exhibited in such an exemplary manner on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] were tremendously helpful in bring about the best possible results from this conference.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am very delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] for his very clear résumé of the proceedings of the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Spain. May I also say that I know the entire delegation shares with me the feeling that Congressman PIRNIE once again distinguished himself and brought great credit to the United States for the way he handled his heavy and manifold responsibilities as chairman of our IPU delegation. Under his guidance all the delegates were given the chance to participate in daily planning meetings held each morning so that we could exchange notes and information on the progress of the work of the various committees to which we were assigned. This resulted in intelligent teamwork and the ability to hold knowledgeable discussions with delegates of the other countries on all facets of the important questions under discussion.

My specific assignment at Palma was to serve on the Economic and Social Committee. I served on this Committee with Representative W. R. POAGE and Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN. Here again, I would like to pay tribute to both Representative POAGE and Senator JORDAN for their contributions to the discussions of two very important international questions concerning international trade and the international monetary system. Congressman POAGE served as our representative on the drafting committee which finalized the wording of the resolution that will be debated at the fall meeting in Moscow. A great deal of credit goes to Congressman POAGE for

successfully resisting any attempts to draft a resolution that would distort the question or include unfortunate implications. For your information the resolution that will be debated at Moscow concerns methods of assisting developing countries in the field of foreign trade by fixing equitable and stable prices for their exported products as well as for goods imported by them from industrialized countries.

I am sure all our colleagues are interested in the problem presented by this resolution—the fact that the economic growth and the development of developing countries is tied to and limited by their ability to acquire foreign exchange. Because of our heavy foreign aid commitments in many of these countries, we have a large stake in helping them to work toward more economic independence so as to lessen their dependence upon foreign aid. Unfortunately, many of the solutions proposed by the developing countries themselves are apt to be one sided and shortsighted. We sincerely hope that our delegation at the Moscow conference can successfully point out some truths that will inspire parliamentary delegates from member nations to recommend practical and effective remedies beyond the limits of manipulation of prices of commodities and other questions of foreign exchange earnings.

Along with other members of the delegation I urge all Members of this House to help us achieve the full potential of the goals of the IPU meetings by studying our chairman's report and offering us their advice and guidance on the crucial questions that will be debated next fall in Moscow.

I thank the gentleman from New York very much for performing the service of bringing this report to our colleagues in the House and the Senate and, again, I pay him tribute for his outstanding performance as chairman of the delegation.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington, and I am reminded of the great work that she did on behalf of our delegation at the conference in Ottawa when, under very trying conditions, she and Congressman JONES from Missouri so effectively represented this Nation during the brief absence of the remainder of the delegation obliged to return here to meet the problems of the House in session. The remarks that she has made about the opportunity which lies ahead in Moscow are appreciated. There is no one who worked more sincerely to achieve the objectives of the conference we had in Palma and to prepare for the Moscow meeting than my colleague from Washington, and I am very, very proud and happy to have her as a member of the delegation.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, international meetings in which Members of the Congress participate are more difficult and more challenging at the present time than at any

period in our recent history. I am confident that all of my colleagues who have had occasion to take part in such gatherings are aware that the numerous international complications, particularly the war in Vietnam, make it more difficult than usual to resolve problems affecting our Nation in its relations with other nations.

At the same time, exchanges between Representatives of our U.S. Congress and Members of the parliaments of other countries are of greater significance today than they would be during a period of relative international tranquillity.

The recent Inter-Parliamentary Union Spring Conference in Spain proved these points.

The problem of meeting and explaining the war in Vietnam was one which required the greatest skill and diplomacy. I noted particularly that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the chairman of the U.S. delegation, handled this subject expertly when he addressed the delegates from more than 50 nations in the New Congress Building at Palma de Mallorca. In reporting the U.S. position the gentleman was able to draw upon his knowledge as a member of the House Armed Services Committee as well as his past experiences at numerous earlier Inter-Parliamentary Union conferences. Another important discussion of our Nation's role in Vietnam and Southeast Asia was presented by the vice chairman of the U.S. delegation, the gentleman from Alabama, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. There were numerous other public expressions delivered in the various committee sessions. I was privileged to take part in the business of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Committee along with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

In addition to the formal meetings of the Union and the committee sessions, the individual exchanges which occurred outside of the meeting halls were perhaps of even greater importance in promoting the interests of our Nation with influential representatives of the other member countries. The contacts which members of the U.S. delegation have developed with parliamentarians from other nations have enabled us to advance our national interests to a degree which it is difficult to measure but which is invariably reflected in the final results of the Interparliamentary Union proceedings.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming election last fall at Tehran of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] to the 10-member executive committee of the Interparliamentary Union. I observed also that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] was enthusiastically reelected as vice chairman of the Political Committee. In my own case, I am privileged to serve again as rapporteur of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Committee to report in Moscow on behalf of the entire committee on "Parliament's Role in the Elaboration and Control of National Scientific Policy."

These expressions of confidence in our U.S. delegation are in themselves evi-

dences that our national position has received understanding and also support.

Our success is also evidenced in the language employed in various of the resolutions adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council—including those which will be debated at the September meeting in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all of the members of the U.S. delegation to the recent IPU Conference are proud of the results achieved. Indeed this should provide a source of pride for the Congress itself and for all of the people of our Nation.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] for his leadership in this successful work. I congratulate also all of my other colleagues and the staff of the delegation who took part in this memorable and successful event.

Mr. PIRNIE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that probably no one has contributed more effectively to the work of the conference than has he. It is worthy to note, when we are speaking of recognition, that within his group he has been repeatedly named as the rapporteur, which is a position of honor given to one who is capable and knowledgeable so that the debates can properly be reported. He was also the author of a resolution which received generous approval and he has actively participated in all of our activities within the group and within the conference.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend him not only for his ability but for his faithfulness and his genuine, sustained interest.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is worth noting that there are some changes taking place within the Interparliamentary Union which bode good for all of us—changes that have been made possible as in this last spring meeting. For that meeting to have taken place in Spain is an accomplishment. In past years Communist countries would not have voted so that it could happen. The Spanish Government would not have allowed Communist delegations to be in their country and would not have invited them.

The meeting in Moscow extends that flexibility which is developing and the opportunity to break down barriers that exist between the nations because here too there will be the need for the Russians to invite to Moscow members of countries with which they do not presently have diplomatic relations.

This was one of the points about which there was discussion. For example—would the South Koreans be invited and be allowed to attend. We have every assurance that they will be.

These developing events, it seems to me, are of extreme importance because they do show that given time nations can come to a better understanding and that the obstacles that have grown up between them can be diminished and that hazards can be overcome. It gives us cause to be optimistic despite the crisis in which we find ourselves at the moment. This is a

good development and one which we hope will continue in the future.

Mr. PIRNIE. As further evidence of the trend to which you have referred, the projected conference in Moscow also includes an invitation to the leader of the U.S. group to participate in a forum for two evenings on television on the general subject of the relations between constituents and their Congressman, which is a story we are delighted to tell. It is so different from that which is experienced in many other countries.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I will predict that the gentleman from New York will be an instant hit on Russian television.

THE WOBBLY KENNEDY ROUND AND OUR ANGRY MERCHANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, from such reports as are available from the press and other sources the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations in Geneva is still in trouble and in a state of uncertainty. It is nearly 5 years since the Trade Expansion Act was passed in 1962. In no other instance has so much time been consumed with such uncertain results.

The Kennedy round is the sixth in a series of international tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Never before has there been so much confusion, such divergence of attitudes among the contracting parties as in the present instance.

The reason may be that after five previous tariff-cutting sessions, beginning with the first GATT agreement in 1947, much greater caution has come to prevail and much greater concern is felt about further cuts. Many industries in many countries have about used up their margin of safety, if indeed they have not already become overexposed to import competition. It is natural that the leading trading countries should examine more closely what further reduction of trade barriers would mean. Let us not forget that the Kennedy round was and is an American proposal.

We placed ourselves in the role of petitioners from the outset. We were and are the proponents. This fact placed our trading partners in the position of dispossers.

The meaning of this was not lost on the other members of GATT. They were in the position of the wooed, and therefore they could wait. That they were prepared to wait us out became clearer as the negotiations proceeded on their dismal round. At one time the negotiations came to a complete standstill for nearly a year because of French intransigence.

The European Economic Community, or Common Market, was the principal actor in the successive delays caused for the most part by failure to meet deadlines. The United States bowed in each instance, to such an extent that a deadline was no longer a deadline. It was no more than a meaningless date.

The latest deadline, put forward not

long ago as the absolute deadline, was April 30. Now that date has gone the way of all the others. Yes, we have been the wooers and pursuers, and the EEC has been more than coy.

Now we are in the position of having spent all the deadlines and still being without an agreement. Clearly we have been outwaited and outmaneuvered. The other countries know how eager we are to achieve an agreement, if for no other reason than to avoid the ignominy, as our State Department sees it, of a failure. The EEC countries know that a failure would not be ignominious and unbearable, but also know that we would so regard it. Therefore they have the upper hand.

If any further evidence were needed to show how far our negotiators are willing to go in order to achieve an agreement under the Kennedy round we have it in the proposal now being made to reach an international agreement on grains. The extremity to which they have gone will become clear when we take a look at the latest proposal our negotiators have advanced; but first we must go back a little.

Members of this body who have kept abreast of the Kennedy round will recall that the American position from the beginning has been that the United States would not negotiate industrial tariffs unless other countries gave us satisfactory concessions on agricultural items. This was the position taken by the late Honorable Christian Herter when he was the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

The position was reasserted subsequently by Messrs W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Special Representative, and by William Roth, also a Deputy Special Representative, who has recently been appointed to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Herter's death.

Mr. Blumenthal, at a press conference in St. Louis, December 7, 1965, quoting the President, said:

We are striving for fully reciprocal trade liberalization which will open new markets for both industrial and agricultural products.

On December 15, the same year, Mr. Irwin R. Hedges, Agricultural Trade Specialist, of the Herter office, speaking in Lincoln, Nebr., before the annual convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers, said:

We have repeatedly emphasized that a successful negotiation must provide improved access to world markets for U.S. agricultural products, including wheat . . . I assure you we have no intention of negotiating any arrangement that is not in the interest of wheat farmers.

William R. Roth, speaking before the Japanese-American Trade Council in New York City, on February 1, 1966, reaffirmed the position. Said he:

From the outset, the United States insisted—an insistence repeatedly emphasized—that meaningful liberalization of agricultural trade must be an integral part of the negotiations.

Later, on February 14, 1966, before the American Management Association, New York City, he repeated the same thesis. At that time Mr. Roth said:

Nevertheless, the principle of the inclusion of agriculture is firmly established. It is not a question of swapping industrial for agricultural concessions: on all sides there is a growing realization that agriculture is a part of the total economy, not a separate, independent field of endeavor. The interdependence of agricultural and industrial products requires that they be treated together in any international trade negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, these quotations should be sufficient to establish the position of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

More recently Mr. Roth, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, after his appointment to the post he now occupies, reaffirmed the position on agricultural negotiations. The industrial tariffs would not be negotiated unless satisfactory concessions were received on agricultural items.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when the EEC finally made its offer on agricultural products, it was a far cry from anything that could be regarded as acceptable.

The United States had indeed already compromised its position in the Ministerial Council Agreements of May 1963 and May 1964. Since the EEC countries were in the midst of very difficult negotiations of their own among themselves in an effort to establish a common agricultural policy and had many hurdles to surmount, we agreed to accept an agreement that we would not be squeezed out of their agricultural market. Instead of bargaining for an improved position in their market, which was the supposed purpose of the Kennedy round, we agreed to something called a guaranteed access. This is to say we were willing to be satisfied not with a gain, but with a promise that we could hold our own.

It developed, however, that the offer made by the EEC was not such a guarantee. Our exports would be at the mercy of the variable import fee that would deprive us of any competitive advantages in the EEC countries.

In this dilemma our negotiators looked about for a substitute. Having looked at the EEC offer, which is secret, and finding it pitifully inadequate, they groped for some other device that would save the Kennedy round.

In casting about, the negotiators hit on the international grain agreement. Someone seized upon the idea that if the other industrial countries would agree to contribute grain toward feeding of the hungry people of the world, thus relieving us of the totality of the burden, this action might take the place of the "guaranteed access" to their markets for our agricultural exports. If, for example, France should set aside a million tons of wheat for food-hungry people in India, such action might enable us to ship a million tons of wheat into France that we could not have done otherwise.

This is a long way around the barn, Mr. Speaker, and shows the desperation of our negotiators. It reflects a deplorable situation. I will say no more about it because other Members may wish to express themselves, except to say that our negotiators should have known that they had thrown the game long before

it came to this desperate pass. When our delegates go into negotiations with eagerness to reach an agreement written all over their faces, it would have been a dull and stupid trader on the other side who would not have known that all he had to do was to stall and wait. At the very end those who had shown their eagerness so clearly, would find themselves in exactly the dilemma that now confronts the President's Special Representative.

The only sound and sensible thing to do now would be to stand by the initial conditions agreed to, which is guaranteed access, bad as that was, and let the chips fall where they may. We made a false start. Let us correct our stance now before it becomes the standard for all future time. If we wish above all to have a Kennedy round we will of course get it; but it will bear little relation to reciprocity.

If the EEC countries will not meet their commitments we should forget the Kennedy round. This would, in any case, be the best possible outcome for the many and growing number of our industries that already face withering import competition without further tariff reduction.

Mr. Speaker at this time, I want to put into the RECORD a few of the remarks and some of the testimony of Mr. Irving Glass, representing the Tanners Council of America.

I do this in my continuing efforts to awaken the Congress of the United States to the serious dangers involved in our present trade policies.

Unless we change our thinking this Nation will have a revolution headed by angry and disturbed Americans, both workers and employers.

STATEMENT OF MR. IRVING GLASS, ON BEHALF OF THE TANNERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

MR. GLASS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DENT. Mr. Glass, we are happy to have you with us.

MR. GLASS. Well, I am grateful for the privilege of being able to talk to you and the members of the committee. I trust Congressman Bell's industry or California might elicit some facts that might be of particular interest to him in California and Japan.

I beg your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, for not giving you a prepared statement. I should like the privilege of submitting one to you within several days.

It is now in preparation.

I might add that the reason I do not have it with me is we have decided recently that we must begin eschewing all of the pro forma conventional arguments and discussions on the issues of foreign trade and tariffs.

We recognize the province of your committee, sir, and we believe that that, in a sense, emphasizes precisely what you indicated a few minutes ago. You are concerned with economic viability of this country; and so are we.

It is our opinion, sir, that the conventional discourse which we have had for generations in this country on high tariffs and low has become pretty meaningless.

It is an anachronism. The discussion in more recent years about such matters as escape clauses and anti-dumping procedure, remedies available to industry, are, from our point of view, utterly meaningless. We have been through them. It is our position, sir, that at this juncture in our economic history, what we need is a revolution in the thinking of the Congress, the thinking of the United States.

We must have a complete change in a philosophy which is outworn. We are now living at the tail end of an illusion which began sometime ago in the thirties.

I think the consequences of that illusion, its perpetuation by the administrative agencies, the pro forma doctrine which has been espoused again and again, emphasizing diplomatic or political considerations at the expense of industrial welfare, of business welfare, of jobs in the United States, is running out.

Time is running out on us. And what I should like to do with you gentlemen, if I may, is discuss with you our case history as an illustrative history of a development in the United States and in world trade today which has the most ominous kind of shadows.

The tanning industry is not a large industry. Our total employment is somewhere in the area of 30,000 production workers. We have plants in the northeast, in the midwest, in Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, Area, and on the west coast.

We have some 14 tanners on the west coast.

We suffer, not alone from the imports of leather competing with our production here, we suffer because every pair of shoes imported into the United States, every Japanese baseball glove coming into this country—and last year, 68 percent of the gloves and mits used in our national sport came from Japan.

We suffer when work glove imports increase as they have within the past 14 months by some two or three hundred percent from Japan and from Europe. But beyond that, beyond the loss of capital, the eventual liquidation of plant, the loss of jobs, the great many small communities where tanners are located, we are concerned, as an old traditional industry.

We are concerned with the fact that certain fundamental truths are being lost sight of, and we look to Congress, we look to your committee, to become the active germinal influence in generating and developing a force of thinking in this country which can face up to an issue in modern terms, and do something which can help make the American economy viable for the long run.

Let me give you some excerpts from the lengthier statement which you will have very shortly. Will you be good enough, sir, to pass them?

(The documents referred to follow:)

"TANNERS' COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 9, 1967.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the suggestion of constituents in your state we take the liberty of enclosing the leading article from the Tanners' Council membership bulletin of December 30th.

"Our industry is confronted with an exceedingly dangerous problem in foreign trade. The consequences will seriously affect shoe manufacturers, retailers and the consuming public. Above all, the continued record export of cattle hides from the U.S. could easily lead to a critical situation in the procurement and production of boots and other leather products for our Armed Forces.

"Our industry has never asked for anything more than equity and reciprocity in foreign trade. We believe the time is long past due for a critical appraisal by Congress of the inequities in foreign trade which lead to loss of raw material and a simultaneous flood of imports of finished goods. The survival of the domestic industry is at stake. Even more important, the ability of our country to satisfy its own requirements in civilian and military leather products may be jeopardized.

"We hope that the constituents of your state can look to you for support. If we

can furnish you with any additional information please call on us.

"Sincerely yours,

"IRVING R. GLASS,
Executive Vice President."

[From the Council News, Tanners' Council of America, Dec. 30, 1966]

"FOREIGN TRADE: OMINOUS FACTS

"The last issue of this bulletin in recent years has ventured into the appraisal of prospects for the year ahead. Such appraisal is secondary this year end to the long range implications once again exposed, emphasized and underlined by the November foreign trade figures. The report for last month should not be read cursorily. It is startling and might well be ominous.

"In November, U.S. cattle hide exports reached 1,698,000. Granted valid question or qualification with respect to the cut hides included in this total, it remains the largest ever. The Council estimates that these shipments represented 58% of all the hides produced in November and a considerably larger percentage of the packer and commercial slaughter. Was this extraordinary export volume merely the aftermath of export controls being suspended on November 7th? It would be reassuring to think so but far too much evidence suggests the alternative—a dangerous long-term trend.

"The trend has been under way for more than a decade. Seemingly moderate year to year changes have masked its impact. That is no longer the case; complacency has become impossible. Tanners, and their customers, are faced with the gravest issue of modern times for the leather, the shoe and the leather goods industries. It is two pronged—loss of raw material resources at home and abroad and a huge increase in the imports of finished products.

"On the raw material side a look at the facts from 1954 on brings the trend into focus. This period was not chosen to make a statistical point; it is the period in which the strangling chain of foreign trade events began. The links include a steady rise in the volume and proportion of U.S. hide and skin supply exported; a sharp decline in the availability and movement of foreign hides and skins to the U.S. On net balance this country has suffered a drastic loss in raw material resources.

"Here is a table that tells part of the story. It is doubled in spades by the foreign trade facts in calfskins and kips and compounded by a huge shrinkage in imports of goat and kidskins.

"Cattle hides
[Thousands of hides]

	Total U.S. hide supply	Exports	Percent exports of slaughter
November 1966.....	22,900	1,698	58.6
11 months 1966.....	32,500	13,007	40.0
Total, 1965.....	34,550	13,309	38.5
Total, 1954.....	27,480	5,178	18.8

"What are the major forces taking U.S. hides and skins or foreclosing foreign supply from the tanners of this country? They may be familiar but must be spelled out to emphasize a basic inequity underlying each instance. Japan, for example, buying U.S. hides in mounting quantities, returning baseball gloves or radio cases to the U.S., has never opened its markets to U.S. leather. Japan has welched on promise after promise to grant reciprocity, and it has been permitted to do so. Eastern Europe is now the major factor in the world hide market. Buyers representing that area have the incredible advantages of a controlled economy with

price secondary to economic and political purposes. Rupees accumulated from Soviet sales or purported aid grants to India are used to buy goatskins. Perhaps rupees from the same source are converted in some fashion to acquire hides in the U.S. It is pointless to ask whether any of the hundreds of millions of rupees credited for U.S. wheat have ever been used for commercial pur-

poses. In Western Europe the Common Market is an instrument for discrimination against the U.S.; leather tariffs are far higher than insignificant U.S. duties; direct and indirect subsidies promote exports. Even in the Western Hemisphere a dozen inequities can be cited ranging from the higher comparative tariffs of Canada to outright embargoes in Latin America.

"Hide export destinations

"[Thousands of hides]"

	"Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Total
November 1966.....	190	551	532	284	1,698
11 months, 1966.....	3,705	2,389	3,789	2,346	13,907
Total, 1966.....	3,777	1,821	5,070	1,968	13,309
Total, 1954.....	879	321	2,766	1,031	5,178

"Even less solace can be drawn from the other side of the coin. Imports of shoes, leather and leather products into the U.S. have reversed the historic position. Such imports now account for a very sizeable fraction of U.S. consumption and the rate of increase has accelerated. All too often, U.S. raw material returns to these shores as finished goods. In many other cases abridgment of free competitive trade through discriminatory restrictions or through subsidization is responsible for the import tide.

"In effect tanners and manufacturers are having their candles burnt at both ends. The consequences go beyond the direct and immediate interests of domestic industry. National welfare and security are involved. In the broadest sense the root causes of inequity in foreign trade must be dealt with

by Government. The time has come when the entire industry, in every affected community, must lay the facts before the responsible agencies of Government so that the minimal charity of economic fair play can be aggressively demanded and gained for home industries. Congress convenes on January 10th; there is no time to lose.

"November details

"Raw material. A summary of November exports is shown below. It has previously been noted that the accuracy of shipments reported as 'cattle hides except whole' has been questioned and it is impossible to estimate the degree of inaccuracy in this category. Reported totals for cattle hides, calfskins and kips were all above a year ago for the eleven months.

"U.S. raw stock exports

"[Thousands of pieces]"

	November 1966	October 1966	November 1965	11 months' total	
				1966	1965
Cattle hides, whole.....	1,261	764	931	10,430	10,527
Cattle hides, except whole.....	437	344	105	2,577	1,505
Total.....	1,698	1,108	1,036	13,007	12,032
Calfskins.....	136	120	209	1,920	1,706
Kips.....	39	25	44	483	442
Sheep and lamb wool on.....	139	131	220	1,728	1,809
Sheep and lamb pickled.....	40	111	104	529	772

"The net balance of foreign trade through November was as follows:

"U.S. foreign trade in raw stock, 11 months' totals

"[Thousands of pieces]"

	"Exports and reexports		Imports		Net balance	
	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965
Cattle hides.....	13,022	12,042	189	263	-12,833	-11,779
Calfskins.....	1,928	1,730	220	422	-1,708	-1,308
Kips.....	483	442	391	583	-92	+141
Goat and kidskins.....	403	328	9,967	13,021	+9,564	+12,693
Sheep and lambskins.....	2,830	2,745	34,338	28,641	+31,508	+25,896
Cabrettas.....			1,205	1,475	+1,205	+1,475

"Leather. Exports in most categories moved up a little. Imports remained large. All of the detail on raw material and leather will be issued this week in the usual monthly foreign trade bulletin."

"IMPORTS OF LEATHER, SHOES AND OTHER LEATHER PRODUCTS

(By Tanners' Council of America, Inc.)

"Imports of leather, shoes and leather products have reached record proportions. This trade is one sided and non-reciprocal.

The direct result is an unprecedented invasion of the U.S. market, an invasion which clearly threatens the future of American industry. The scope of the invasion and its danger are apparent from the following summary figures.

"Imports of shoes. The shoe imports recorded below include only leather types. In addition, millions of pairs of vinyl, canvas and non-leather types were brought in during 1966, enough to make the gross import total equal 16 percent of aggregate U.S. footwear production.

"Leather footwear (000 omitted)

"[In pairs]"

	Imports	Exports
1952.....	1,216	4,825
1953.....	1,235	5,159
1954.....	1,049	4,750
1955.....	1,785	4,642
1956.....	2,996	4,532
1957.....	4,956	4,398
1958.....	16,099	4,225
1959.....	11,057	3,505
1960.....	12,980	3,244
1961.....	15,078	3,035
1962.....	21,106	2,867
1963.....	26,162	2,843
1964.....	27,557	2,836
1965.....	34,723	2,491
1966.....	46,036	2,737

"In 1966, there were also imported more than 46,000,000 pairs of vinyl shoes and 35,000,000 pairs of rubber-canvas types, making a grand total of 132,187,600 pairs.

"Foreign trade in leather. The traditional relation of leather exports and imports has been completely reversed. Last year imports far outweighed exports from the U.S. and accounted for a substantial proportion of domestic consumption."

Mr. GLASS. Those contrast imports and exports, and give you the picture in essence of what is developing, Gentlemen.

On one sheet, you will notice, is the cattle hide position, and on the next sheet, you will notice the comparative figures on imports of shoes.

All of that has taken place within a decade. It is not something that was a problem ten or twelve years or fifteen years ago. Certainly we had problems, tariff problems, in those days, but suddenly, we are faced with a situation which is completely new and unprecedented.

Let me give you the elements of that situation. We are exporting our raw material, as the largest cattle hide producing nation in the world. We are now moving into a position where we are becoming the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the rest of the world.

We are shipping cattle hides, our raw material, to Japan, to Western Europe, to Eastern Europe, to Mexico, to Venezuela, to Colombia, to Peru, to be processed and made into finished leather to be fabricated in shoes, handbags, gloves and a hundred other items and returned to us.

Mr. BELL. Not to Argentina, though.

Mr. GLASS. Not to Argentina. Argentina is the second largest hide producing nation in the world.

Mr. DENT. We buy them from there?

Mr. GLASS. Not anymore. Very few. We in effect are becoming an agricultural underdeveloped nation, looking to the technological skills abroad.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GLASS. The manufacturers of the goods which our retail stores must purvey to consumers. One of our members sent me the other day a column from the Sun Times, in which the columnist makes the point that consumers benefit by the import of these lower cost items, such as shoes from Italy and Spain.

That is part of the illusion. That is part of the tremendous error which has been foisted upon the thinking of this country, and which seems to be more than ever inherent in the thinking of some of the executive agencies of the government of the United States.

The error is fundamental. No economy can live in the long run by taking in one another's wash. If we all become teachers, doctors, lawyers, servicemen, who then will produce the goods?

Who then will function at the base of the economy, producing the productive wealth which is essential to its ultimate sustenance and its viability?

One industry or another may well be found, in the language of certain people in government, expendable. Dozens of industries are not, because ultimately, what happened to the watch business—and I have been fascinated over the years by the demonstration of fact in that industry—what happened to the watch business happens everywhere else, productive equipment is liquidated, capacity is lost, skills are lost, whole technological structure—and it is a complex technological structure which is necessary for the production of goods—begins to disappear.

How did we ever get into a situation in which we export raw material, and we import finished goods? I can answer the question, sir, Congressman Bell, which you asked a few minutes ago about shoe production on the west coast.

Shortly after World War II, we recognized in common with other industries, the validity of our government's program. Japan had to be aided. An aid program had to be extended. We had to put up with certain departures from fair trade practices, from the concept of reciprocity, because there was a dollar shortage in Japan, and Japan had to be put on its feet, and we surmised in our layman's fashion that obviously, Japan had to be kept economically healthy in order to become a bulwark against the spread of ideas from Red China, and so forth.

But that time is long since past. For more than 15 years, we have been asking the State Department to intervene on our behalf to get us a measure of reciprocity from Japan. Time and again Japanese manufacturers, of baseball gloves, for example, and of small leather goods, such as the cases in which their binoculars and their mini-radios come to us, I have been talking to Japanese manufacturers who want to buy leather in the United States.

The Japanese Government still maintains a virtual embargo through currency control, against the import of a single foot of leather from the United States.

Now witness then what happens: We can't compete in the Japanese market. The Japanese manufacturer who wants to buy leather from the west coast tanners, from Calnap, in Napa, California, from Menassie Block in Berkeley, from A. K. Saltz in Santa Cruz, can't buy a foot of leather.

He must go to his own protected tanners, which is in effect a cartel or a monopoly today in Japan. Behind that wall of protectionism, which has nothing to do with tariff, which is an absolute violation of all the GATT conventions, and all the concepts of reciprocity, the Japanese tanners can come forward, come to the west coast and buy hides and on the west coast.

Full half of the hides now produced on the west coast are shipped to Japan. And the Japanese tanners can buy them transport them, transport hide substance, water and manure, 8,000 miles to Japan.

Why? Because their internal market is completely protected against the slightest midget smidgen of possible competition from the tanners on the west coast.

Utterly unfair, inequitable, yes. Nothing has ever been done on it. Within the past two months as a result of a renewed campaign of letter writing by our tanners and their suppliers, we have once again begun to receive the pro forma reply from members of the executive agencies, namely, "Something will be done shortly. We are asking Japan to let down the bars."

Well, we heard that five years ago.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Glass, may I interrupt your very interesting comments?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. I wanted to ask you one little situation. That was just one word, why? Why is this? I mean, why can't we get our story across of this great inequitable situation as far as Japan is concerned?

It would seem to me with all the feelings

that we are involved with with Japan that this inequitable thing would stand out like a sore thumb, according to what your story is.

I can't understand why we can't get that across. What is the stumbling block? What is the administration attitude or is it the administration or who is it that is blocking it?

Mr. GLASS. Well, Sir, I will give you my opinion for whatever it is worth. I have reached the stage of life where I can speak with complete candor, because my conscience is absolutely clear.

In my opinion, what we have is a perpetuated philosophy, a series of egghead concepts which have become so ingrained in all the echelons of government that no one dares depart from them.

I think that when a bureaucracy continues to function, in a given pattern, it is always reluctant to see its tomorrows any different from its yesterdays.

I believe that political and diplomatic considerations, which may have had validity at one time, tend to persist in the operative levels or agencies of the government, and so concepts continue to remain.

There is no question that on grounds of reciprocity or equity of justice, we are absolutely right. Japan ought to let down the bars. But not one agency of government, not the last ambassador, Professor Reischauer, or any one else has yet succeeded in getting even a nod from the Japanese Government.

Mr. BELL. Well, this egghead thing, I see some point to it, all right, I am not arguing against it, except that it does not quite satisfy me. It seems to me that as in any crowd, there is always some bright boy that is going to come up and really insist on this thing and really make an issue of it, public relations wise, or however, if it is so equitable, it would seem to me that if somebody would make such an issue of this that these eggheads would fall on their egg heads.

I just can't quite see that.

Mr. GLASS. What you have got at stake is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, all of the efforts and energy which has gone into that.

Would you venture to jeopardize this at a—this stage which is inimical to the Kennedy Round?

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GLASS. And all of those things seem to have a bearing. Perhaps we are ignorant.

Perhaps there are military, diplomatic or economic considerations of which we know nothing, and obviously, we as laymen have no access to the diplomatic pouch.

Perhaps it is absolutely important that we do things for Japan. Well then, for heaven's sake, why aren't we told? But I believe that the failure to discharge the obligations imposed upon the United States Government by the requirements of our own economy go further.

For example, Mr. Shannon mentioned the indirect subsidy given Italian shoe manufacturers. Some of the subsidies given to German producers, German tanners, German manufacturers. It is called a remission of internal turnover taxes. It amounts in West Germany to seven and a half percent. In France, it amounts to some seven and a half, and depending on the season of the year, towards the end of the year, it can be as much as 13 percent.

We raised that issue once with the U.S. Treasury, which governs the customs law, and interpretation of the customs law. We submitted that such a remission of internal turnover tax was subsidization within the meaning of our tariff act.

The Treasury ruled that it was not, that it was the internal province of a government, of a sovereign government, to control its taxes as it saw fit.

Well, the tanning industry of the United States, the shoe manufacturers of the United States, would love to do business for seven percent. I don't know anybody in our industry who makes seven percent on sales, and

if we export whatever we export is subject to our income tax or whatever other, any excises that apply in the United States, no special dispensation for export, why that conclusion by the Treasury, and why that unremitting adherence to the doctrine that remission of tax is not a subsidy?

We can't account for it. We think it is wrong. We think it is contrary to the congressional intent as embodied in the Tariff statute of the United States.

I am not sure that I have answered your question, sir, because I am not sure that I can. I can't read the mind of the Executive Branch of Government. All I can report to you on is that in executing its functions, under the existing law, we have gradually built up a tremendous complex of inequity which now is beginning to show up in the destruction of the fundamental base of American industry.

Let me give you—

Mr. BELL. The only thing, of course, that is just so amazing to me is that it is so obvious, that such an obvious situation like the one you spoke of, and all the ramifications of it, where even Japan herself could gain by making the change.

Mr. GLASS. Certainly, Congressman Bell. I have argued to our government—

Mr. BELL. It is a difficult one for me to comprehend, how just as a matter of policy we could stick to something like that, if there is even consideration on the other side that that is not equitable, and that they would be better off to have it equitable.

Mr. GLASS. I am leading a group of three tanners to Japan early in June. With the help of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, we are going to exhibit and show U.S. leather.

The objective of our effort is to demonstrate to the Japanese manufacturers that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain from getting access to more diversified, varied materials, such as U.S. leathers, that in turn they can develop their ultimate export trade, that they can raise their standard of living a notch thereby, and we believe that earnestly and sincerely.

Mr. BELL. You think you can get it accomplished by the back door, get Japan to do something?

Mr. DENT. The Department of Agriculture is sponsoring this fair, isn't it?

Mr. GLASS. No, sir, they are paying the way for two men, the air transportation. The tanner's council is paying the way for the third man.

Mr. DENT. I was in Japan with our group. Mr. Bell, you would be interested. I was in Japan with our group when we had a show, a trade show in Tokyo, sponsored by our government, and they were showing super-market equipment, you know, these little carts which you get in supermarkets and all that stuff, and I think that they did not realize what they were doing, but what they were doing was bringing their patterns over there for the Japanese to copy, because I predicted within the year we will be importing the carts from Japan, and we will be, because the Japanese told me that is what they were doing.

They were buying enough of it to take it home and tear it apart and design it, and make it themselves.

Mr. BELL. Yes, but Mr. Chairman, you can see the other point that he was making, where Japan themselves would be gaining by a change.

Mr. DENT. We understand that, but you see, that is not the point. The whole point all over the world is employment. When you get down to the bedrock, you will find that there is only one consideration in trade.

One consideration in trade is a job. A job for a worker. That is the whole consideration, and it is completely ignored in this country. The Japanese admit it. Then in testimony before this committee. Their whole purpose is jobs.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Glass.

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. DANIELS. If we did not ship our leather goods or hides to Japan, would Japan have other available markets available to it?

Mr. GLASS. Yes. Japan could draw on other sources for raw material, but more important, sir, they would have to buy some leather in the United States. There would be a two way trade to their advantage and to ours, in the long run.

Two-way trade, with basic equities, does provide the element of competition which stimulates technology, which stimulates style, which opens markets and raises consumer standards of living.

I was very interested in Mr. Shannon's remarks about the hand sewn shoe in the United States. Three years ago with the help of the Department of Agriculture, we staged a show in Paris. We demonstrated American shoes, American leather.

It was a revelation to the Europeans. We even brought a shoemaker over from Nashua, New Hampshire, to sit on a podium, sewing hand sewn vamps by hand.

The Europeans could not get over it. United States, home of mass production machinery, standardization, actually does hand sewing. We have started something in Europe by that demonstration which has swept Europe today.

They are off on a hand sewn binge, and it has helped us. They are buying our raw material, and we hope, eventually, we can get them to let down the bars in Europe and buy our leather, because we believe we can service their manufacturing economy to even better effect than they can themselves.

Mr. DENT. What about the second part of Mr. Shannon's statement, where he said they are now shipping the hand-sewn shoes back to the United States they showed them how to make?

Mr. GLASS. The answer, Congressman Dent, again is when they are protected by remission of taxes, or by restrictions of one kind or another, which, as you know, are extraterritorial considerations, beyond that, they have advantages which we can't match.

Mr. DENT. We have an extra tariff in the minimum-wage law in this country.

Mr. GLASS. For which no manufacturer gets a remission.

Mr. DENT. That is right, it is a tariff against American made goods.

Mr. DANIELS. Getting back to this tour that you propose to take in the fall with three tanners, in going to Japan, two of whom will be sponsored by the Department of Agriculture—

Mr. GLASS. Right.

Mr. DANIELS. What would be the objective of that trip?

Mr. GLASS. To sell the Japanese manufacturing industry, shoes, handbags, gloves, small cases.

Mr. DANIELS. Our finished products?

Mr. GLASS. The desirability of persuading their Government to let down the bars, to override the objections of the tanners, let some U.S. leather in. We haven't gotten any help from our own Government. We are going to try to do it ourselves, now.

Mr. DANIELS. Will the Japanese people be able to afford this merchandise at prices that would be necessary, which would necessarily have to be paid in order to give American industry a reasonable profit?

Mr. GLASS. We could sell them leather for baseball gloves to be manufactured in Japan, at cheaper prices, far greater value, because our quality is greater.

It is from California, shipped from San Francisco, at better prices than the Japanese manufacturer of baseball gloves can buy in Japan. And that is in spite of the fact that their labor cost is roughly 20 percent of ours.

Mr. DENT. Yes, but they have a cartel which establishes a false selling price on the leather. But in competition they would raise that price immediately.

Mr. GLASS. That is right.

Mr. DANIELS. Who would benefit, sir? The Japanese consumers?

Mr. DENT. No, they don't have that many. Their real consumers are the American baseball industry. That is, the consumers for the Japanese baseball equipment. Sixty-eight or 69 percent of all the gloves used in the American baseball enterprise are imported from Japan.

Mr. BELL. Isn't baseball quite a sport in their country, also?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DANIELS. Why would the Japanese manufacturers sell 68 percent of baseball gloves used by our big leagues in the U.S.A., when you say our leather is superior to the Japanese leather?

Mr. GLASS. In making a baseball glove the labor component is the principal factor. Some 60 percent of the cost of sewing, handling, and molding of the glove is labor.

Mr. DANIELS. I wanted to get that on the record.

Mr. GLASS. One of the factors in Japan is that the going rate today is roughly 43 or 44 cents. On the West Coast, in the San Francisco area, for example, the tanners last contract calls for \$3.10 an hour, plus fringes.

Now, when you get to products where the labor component runs 40 or 50 percent, competition becomes almost insuperable when you are faced with 43-cent labor in Japan.

Isn't that what you are talking about when you say we have to have a revolution in our thinking? The philosophy of trade that we still operate under is outmoded. The events of the world have overtaken the Adam Smith theory, which is basically what we are doing, regardless of whether we try to polish it up with new language. This is very much so.

Mr. DENT. We are still operating on the theory of Adam Smith, that that nation which makes the product cheaper ought to be able to sell it to another nation, so that nation can enjoy the benefits of a product at a lower price, and that in turn should send its products to the country.

But what has happened is, in the centuries that have passed, the generations of recent generations have developed a production capability in every line of goods all over the world.

Mr. GLASS. I would go one step further, perhaps. I concur in your reasoning. I think, as a matter of fact, all industry owes you and your committee, sir, a debt of thanks for your prescience in having recognized these trends and fundamental obligations of revamping our thinking as long ago as five or six years ago.

There is another element that enters into this picture. I need not dwell on all of these considerations. I don't have to tell you that our industry is technologically capable and that we haven't sat on our duffs and let progress go by.

We are as technologically capable, I am sure, far more so, in fact, than any industry in the world, any tanning industry in the world.

Leather is needed today, and we are doing quite a job in supplying the shoes and the leather equipment needed in Southeast Asia. You are familiar with all of that. You have heard those arguments dozens of times. But there is one other consideration that perhaps you may not be aware of, gentlemen.

We are faced, it seems to me, in this necessity for revamping our thinking with a factor that has never come to light before. But it has shown up in our industry to such a startling extent that I think you ought to be interested in it.

Fifteen years ago we were the largest kid-leather producing country in the world. We produced 40-odd million goat and kid skins annually, made leather.

Our business has shrunk now to about 10 million kid skins. Who is producing the kid leather? The Soviet Union.

We used to buy 85 percent of the goat and kid skins from India, and we furnished hard dollars to the Indian economy for shipping us the goat skins. We made these skins into shoes and bags, gloves, jackets, and so on.

India today is shipping almost 90 percent of her goat and kid skins to Eastern Europe. How did this change come about? It did not develop as a result of the operation of the market place. It didn't develop because Soviet or Polish or Rumanian buyers are more capable or their plants are more skilled than ours.

It developed by virtue of the fundamental difference between a free-enterprise economy and an economy which is planned and has, as its objective, political or economic considerations that have nothing to do with the market place.

The Russians gave aid, purported aid, to India. They built a steel mill in Behar, and elsewhere. They got rupee credits, x-hundred millions of rupee credits for that.

We have given aid, enormous aid, to India. We have got counterpart fund credits in rupees. Ours lie idle in India, or they are used to gild the Taj Mahal, or some similar purpose.

The Russians use their rupee credits, garnered from aid, for the purpose of goat skins. Ergo, they can afford to pay a price for goat skins simply impossible for any competitive, commercial U.S. tanner.

What has happened? As a result, the Indian hide skin and leather economy has been sucked into the orbit of the Eastern European system. We have been displaced.

I submit, gentlemen, that that process can happen in a variety of other economic areas, that it represents, to put it bluntly, economic warfare of a kind which we have not yet realized is going on.

Do you know who is one of the principal buyers of our cattlehides today? Eastern Europe.

Mr. BELL. Our what?

Mr. GLASS. Cattlehides. Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, is buying a substantial proportion. In the first three months of this year almost 30 percent of our cattlehides were shipped to Eastern Europe. They were shipped to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Russia. And a great many of those cattlehides will eventually come back to us in the form of the work shoes and the dress shoes from Czechoslovakia about which Mr. Shannon commented previously.

That is a completely new factor in the organization of an economic system, a world foreign-trade system. How are we going to cope with it? Is it not likely that the next step will be titanium? Or titanium ore, or bauxite, or jute, or hemp? Or that the strength of a controlled economic system can be funneled deliberately into a given product area or to a given country, and that it can be utilized to such purpose and in such a way as to capture that economic entity and bring it within the orbit of Eastern Europe?

What I am leading up to fundamentally, gentlemen, is this. I beg your leave to suggest to you, as a committee which has heard testimony on this subject, that perhaps in your own thinking you must concur with the basic philosophy we offer you for revamping our national thinking.

The time has come when the United States, as an island in the world economy, an economy where, as you properly point out, Mr. Chairman, technology has been diffused to such a good extent that everybody today owns the means and the know-how. That as an island in such an economy, the time has come when we must control the traffic on the bridge. That unless we do, we can be swamped.

We can't project these figures. Last year there were record imports of shoes. First quarter of this year, up 24 percent from the first quarter of last year.

Now, I think Mr. Shannon is much too conservative in his paper when he predicts

a loss of some 59,000 jobs by 1970. As an economist, when I project the trend, I say that within two years the shoe industry of the United States—and that means our bread and butter, the tanner's sustenance—the shoe industry of the United States will have suffered irreparable losses. It can't take it. It can't take it because that kind of loss of market no longer means just the loss of economic growth. It means the loss of the basic substratum which we have held.

Mr. BELL. Could I ask a question right here?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that most of the leather and equipment goods that are going to our troops in Viet Nam are from California? I mean, not California, but I mean national industries.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Is that correct?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Therefore, as we increase activities in there, if we do, why this, to some degree, to that extent, helps our industry. Is that correct?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. But it is minor, I assume.

Mr. GLASS. Whether it be major or minor, sir, our point of view is that it is fundamentally abnormal. We hope the day will come—

Mr. BELL. Oh, I agree. There is no argument there. I was just curious about that one point, whether we were doing that, or if we were taking Japanese equipment.

Mr. GLASS. At the moment, and last year, if it were not for military orders placed, the position of the shoe industry and of the leather industry in terms of domestic products and in terms of the ratio of imports to domestic products, would have been far more serious than it actually was.

We are for the legislation that you are sponsoring. You have our unqualified approval. God bless you for initiating that legislation.

But we also suggest to you that in your capacity as legislators, as representatives of American industry and of the American economy, that perhaps you ought to join with us in supporting measures to control imports, to let others share in our growth.

But let us make it an orderly process. Let us incorporate the concept of the Muskie bill, so that the growing process will be extended to others as well as to ourselves, and without their pre-empting our markets and destroying our industry.

That is, it seems to us, the only possible philosophy of a national foreign-trade policy which will allow domestic industry to survive in the long run.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Glass, that, I believe, is the aim of all right-thinking persons. Those of us who have to take a stand that appears to be drastic and oriented completely to a protectionist view do so because we know that all other arguments have failed.

Therefore, in order to bring into focus the problem, we have to take the extreme view. I would be the last to recommend that we close the borders of this country, or any country. But I also must be the first to admit that if we don't do something, the American industry complex has lost its will to fight.

I have right before me the answer that the American industry has given to the problem, and it is becoming more and more the answer. It is the kind of an answer that spells nothing but economic oblivion for this country.

And here is the answer of Stern and Stern. I would just like to read you two or three paragraphs of why this revolution in thinking is necessary.

It is to save the American economy and those who control the economy. Labor does not alone control the economy. The tools of labor control the pace of the economy. When the tools are gone, the whole economy is dead.

Mr. BELL. Will you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I don't think that I understand what you are saying when you speak of "extreme." I am not saying that we don't have to rouse this situation, but I think that the orderly approach, which he emphasized, I think, is of utmost importance, because there are certain areas of international situations where—

Mr. GLASS. If I may clarify my statement, I referred to the control of the commercial traffic between the United States and the rest of the world, the world continent as being desirable to be orderly.

But I do think that at this juncture, where a revolution in anything is needed, the more explosive it can be, sir, the more violent we can get, the more we can make men realize the enormous implications of what is happening, the more likely you are as legislators to prevent damage before it is too late.

Mr. DENT. We are in the position of a person who has been warned by his doctor that if he doesn't take care of that innocent little scratch, that it may become poisoned. He lets it go and lets it go. He cannot cure that greater damage done to himself in an orderly fashion. He has to cut the arm off to save the body. We have to cut the arm off today.

I am serious.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, isn't what you are saying, what we are really saying here, that in our drive to win the political Cold War, we are losing the political Cold War with an economic method?

Mr. DENT. We are losing the greatest war of all, because you can't survive in politics without the sustenance of politics which is economic.

Mr. GLASS. I can give you a clear-cut illustration, Congressman Dent, which will interest you.

Some five years ago we had a case before the Tariff Commission, an unescape-clause proceeding. This was prior to the 1962 Act. It was on calf leather, mounting imports of calf leather.

We pointed out then that if that trend continued, the calf leather industry of the United States would have to go down the drain.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GLASS. The rejoinder at that time was that you have not proved injury. This is prospective and conjectural, in spite of the fact that the law clearly charged the Tariff Commission with potential injury and an appraisal and evaluation of potential injury.

Our forecast has been more than fulfilled. In Pennsylvania the Hulshman plant no longer exists. In Wyoming the Elsendor plant no longer exists. We are down now to five producers of calf leather in the United States, and we rely on imports now for more than 45 percent of our requirements.

Mr. DENT. This is the thing. But let us see what is happening in American industry. What is its thinking in this line? Unless it has a complete change in the philosophy, here is the pattern of the future, because it is already the pattern of the present.

This is from Stern and Stern, and I would like to read it, because I think it is important enough to be heard.

"Dear Congressman Dent:

"I know that there will be hearings on HR-478 and -479 which are aimed at cutting cheap imports which seriously affect American Workers and the industries employing them.

"I am greatly in favor of these Bills and can tell from sad experience that something should be done.

"Several years ago the American Silk Council had a case before the Tariff Commission in endeavoring to have the Tariff raised on light All Silk products. Stern & Stern was represented at the Tariff Meeting

and I made a long deposition which was read at that time.

"The effects of the Government's inactivity to protect the small All Silk industry was that we closed our Easton, Pa., plant known as the Stewart Division—that there were about 170 people thrown out of work—some older ones permanently—the older machinery was scrapped—the newer sold to weaving mills in Mexico and the property has now been disposed of.

"This weaving mill had been in existence since 1902 under the Stewart Management and we took same over in 1931 and, unfortunately, had to liquidate in 1965.

"We fought the Japanese imports unsuccessfully for one year and almost all our silk needs, which are considerable, are now being imported from Japan and in this way making our balance of payments worse and taking work away from the American working man..."

Now I read that because in hearings five years ago before this committee, the then-Congressman Scranton, later Governor of Pennsylvania, testified that they had numerous silk-textile mills in the Scranton area. They came into being after the World War II.

The people in Scranton, there are many skilled workers in the lace industries up there, are very fine needle work people and textile workers.

Because of imports we were down to four mills working part-time in 1962. I asked the Japanese trade council representative to appear. I asked questions about silk textiles, because Mr. Scranton at that time testified that we were buying 25 million dollars worth of raw silk a year for these mills. We were now importing 25 million dollars worth of finished textiles, so the money balance was exactly the same.

I asked the Japanese witness why they decided to sell the manufactured product rather than the raw product, which was a national product of export, when the dollar volume of business was identical, almost to the penny.

He said, "The dollar volume is only important insofar as making world credits available. But the most important item in our economy is the number of jobs. We are weaving the textiles out of our own silk to create the employment for our people."

So even the hardest-headed free trader and the hardest-headed protectionist, when they sit down at the table, must agree that the only thing being bartered today are the jobs of workmen. Nothing else is, because industry can survive.

Stern and Stern is not losing any money. They are still selling their silk textiles. But what they are selling is imported, and the jobs of the 170 people in industry are completely gone.

The danger that we face is the greatest upheaval in the world's history, because once the American consumer market dries up, and it will dry up at the rate of three consumers for every job loss in production—

I say this as a curbstone economist, and I defy anybody to prove me wrong, that when the American consumer market dries up, not alone will we go down the drain. The exporting nations who depend for their internal economy on their exports to the others will go down the drain. And the greatest of all world upheavals will take place in our lifetime.

You remember what I tell you. This is a prediction. I hope I never live to see it, because it is inevitable.

Mr. GLASS. I am sorry to say, sir, that in my opinion as an economist, we are far closer to the consummation of that prediction than has been realized in these United States. And one day, when the flow of dollars from the United States is interrupted, the lifeline of Europe and the lifeline of Japan will suffer very seriously. Their well-being depends on our well-being.

Mr. DENT. There is no question about it. We have testimony here where production is created in West Germany for the simple purpose of exporting to the United States. And they don't even have the labor of their own. They import their labor force from Italy. And they export the product to the United States.

This cannot exist in a free world. It cannot exist.

Mr. GLASS. Sooner or later the cornucopia runs dry, and the goose is killed.

Mr. DENT. We cannot help it. It is just one of those instances in which we have lead the world into a freedom from colonialism, political colonialism, and we are leading the world into economic colonialism, which will have graver effects than any political colonialism ever had on the world.

I speak as a man who is distinctly disturbed, even not considering the condition of our own precarious financial structure in the United States, with feeding people, on one hand, for not being employed, because their jobs have been taken away from them. This is as unsound as it can be.

Mr. BELL. In other words, what you are saying is that we are doing so many things that are helping other nations build up their economies and our nation to become an outlet for them, or import area for them, that we are stifling our own industry to the point where even the consumers in our country will not be buying all these things.

Mr. DENT. That is right. The automobile industry is down in production, but no one is saying why. The reason is that the automobile industry for the production they are losing in the United States, is importing automobiles from Europe and selling them through their agencies.

The automobile industry, the corporate shareholder, doesn't lose. The consumer loses, because he doesn't have the money to buy, because every producer is a consumer. That is the only consumer you have.

You and I are parasites. We are parasites on the body politic and body economic of this country. We do not produce anything.

Mr. BELL. Lawyers, doctors, schoolteachers are all the same.

Mr. DENT. We are parasitic, and we can't become a nation of parasites.

Mr. GLASS. I ran into a shoemaker—Congressman Dent, this will interest you—I was in Spain two weeks ago, for two days, and I ran into a shoe manufacturer, an American shoe manufacturer. He was there dickering for a plant. And I took him to task.

Mr. DENT. That is right. Listen to this, Al. This is very important.

Mr. BELL. I am listening.

Mr. GLASS. I ran into this American shoe manufacturer. He had been vehement in protesting against imports and the injury they had been causing him.

He was in Spain dickering for the purchase of a plant to produce shoes there. Obviously, I took him to task. And he said, "What can I do? Competition forces me to do it. My chain-store customers are importing shoes. If I can't get in on the act, I will be forced out. Stop everyone from doing it, and I would be more than happy not to undertake this venture myself."

So you have a divisive element entering into business interest today which distorts and muddles the picture.

ernment, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, is contemplating starting a newspaper—the first step to a controlled press.

Freedom of the press is something that we must protect, and the shocking news that a demonstration project plan is now under consideration by the Office of Economic Opportunity for a community action news demonstration project in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties of North Carolina, which border my district, the First District of Tennessee, is indeed frightening.

It is proposed by WAMY Community Action, Inc., headquartered in Boone, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of the most cherished rights of our people. There has been grave concern recently of a controlled press from the standpoint of the extent to which the Executive should and does control the output of facts. This development in our press organization has been extremely disturbing.

Now we are faced with a plan for the Government to back a newspaper, and this plan would destroy completely and fully our right to freedom of the press. This plan is more than potentially dangerous, it is insidious.

If this plan is not rejected immediately, I recommend that the Congress not lose 1 minute in stepping in to halt this misguided destroyer of our freedom.

I am calling on Sargent Shriver for a full report of this action and am asking him to never let this plan see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the full demonstration project plan and supporting data, which outlines this insidious venture. I know this material will be of great interest to all my colleagues.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PLAN AND SUPPORTING DATA FOR A COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN WATAUGA, AVERY, MITCHELL, AND YANCEY COUNTIES, N.C.

A. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

This project is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of \$3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1100 square miles of mountainous, wooded country-side on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements, in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey in western North Carolina. Almost without exception these people are the direct descendants of pioneers of the early 1800's with a long history of subsistence farming and foraging, untouched by prosperity down to the present day.

(See "Background Paper on Operation of W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.," in Part II, Supporting Data, for more details on the history and characteristics of the low-income population.)

The central characteristic of the low income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other. From the earliest days of settlement, the families and small clusters of families whose descendants make up the local poor have remained established in isolated homes or tiny settlements. Lack of good roads and lack of money to buy vehicles and telephones have maintained the physical factor in isolation.

The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation. They are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes. They find it extremely difficult to cope with other people and are generally reserved and distrustful of strangers. Their capacities for group feeling and group endeavor have not been developed. Their history shows few examples of cooperative endeavor. Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that, is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. Their "communities" are in many cases not communities at all, but merely clusters of interrelated families, fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief, maintained in physical proximity only by the formidable obstacles of establishing livelihoods elsewhere.

The physical and psychological situation of these people makes it difficult to achieve two major objectives of the war on poverty: 1) achievement of effective community organization, and 2) improvement of social services.

The applicant CAA has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

The CAA has also expended a great deal of effort attempting to increase the services received and available to the poor from the CAA and non-CAA agencies. It has attempted this through three general approaches:

(1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation, (2) exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor, and (3) organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them. Despite a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts, the agency services available are underused, and local agencies remain underfinanced through lack of pressure on the bodies responsible for financing them.

A list of specific problems to be addressed in this Project are implied in the specific hypotheses set out in the following section.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesized that a project such as the one herein proposed for financing shall demonstrate the effectiveness of such projects in achieving the objectives listed below, all of which are either intrinsically desirable or instrumental to the elimination of poverty.

1. Creating, among the poor, a greater awareness of the fact that their predicaments, problems, hopes and aspirations are shared by many other individuals and communities across the four-county area, and thus helping create the feeling of identity necessary to concerted effort for improvement. This awareness would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

2. Creating, among the poor, a greater feeling of familiarity with people and places in the area beyond their immediate settlement, and thus helping develop attitudes conducive to cooperation across wide areas. This feeling of familiarity would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

3. Strengthening, among low-income individuals and communities, the feelings of self-significance and importance that will arm them for the task of coping with the systems and institutions that they should

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS MUST BE PROTECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to each Member of the Congress and to each reader of the RECORD the information that the U.S. Gov-

utilize for their advancement. The poor will be assisted to this end through the experiences of being interviewed, broadcast, and quoted in print.

4. Establishing the belief, among the poor, that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful.

5. Improving the poor's awareness of, interest in, familiarity with and demand for the opportunities provided through the CAA and through other social agencies. These objectives will be achieved through announcements of services and opportunities, and through the printed and broadcast testimony of low-income persons who have benefited through these opportunities.

6. Causing the existing social agencies, including the CAA, to concern themselves with the quality of execution of their programs and to be attentive to the preferences of the poor in the administration of their programs. These results would seem to follow if the poor are allowed to speak their minds on the air and in print.

7. Increasing the understanding, on the part of the middle-class, of the nature and problems of the poor and the utility of services provided by social agencies, an understanding critical to developing the necessary local support for anti-poverty efforts. This will be achieved through the middle-class's exposure to the radio broadcasts and occasional reading of the weekly newspaper.

C. METHODS, PROGRAM TECHNIQUES, WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1. Introduction

The aims of this Project will be carried out through two vehicles: (1) a four-county-wide weekly newspaper and (2) a radio program development and broadcasting system. The two vehicles will be directed and coordinated by a single Project Director, who will edit the newspaper and generally supervise the work of the Broadcast Development Staff. The Project Director will report to a Board of Directors composed of 8 low-income and 5 non-low-income persons who will set general and editorial policy for the newspaper and for radio broadcasts.

The weekly newspaper will be staffed, with the exception of the editor, with local low-income people, who will act as reporters and assistant editors. The paper will be directed at the low-income readership, and will be distributed by mail, free, to all families in the four counties whose incomes fall below the OEO poverty-level. The newspaper will be printed by a local commercial printer.

The radio system will have two (2) professional staffers (Broadcast Developers) in addition to the Project Director, and the remaining four (4) people on the staff will be drawn from the local low-income population. The radio system staff, to be equipped with mobile recording vans, will travel throughout the low-income community taping programs for broadcast over the commercial stations that serve the area. The staff will also accept announcements and programs of interest and service to low-income people from the local CAA and from other public agencies.

2. The weekly newspaper

The weekly newspaper will be the most conventional of the information techniques to be demonstrated, in that the techniques of writing and printing a paper of this type are well known, although little used by the commercial press. The first, and most essential feature of the newspaper will be saturation circulation among the poverty-level residents of the four county area. This will be achieved by mailing the paper to all poor residents at no charge. Extensive mailing lists are presently available from the Community Action Agency files, and the

Community Action field workers will be mobilized to add to the list as rapidly as possible. The twenty community "stringers" will also contribute to the mailing list. In its initial months of operation the paper will also hand distribute copies to community centers, schools and country stores, and will solicit readers to subscribe for themselves and their friends through subscription blanks which will be printed as a regular feature of the paper. It is expected that the newspaper can build to mailed circulation among almost all of the approximately 8,000 poverty-level families of the area within three months after it starts publication.

Although the paper will be circulated free-of-charge to its subscribers, the addressed, mailing method of circulation will prevent the paper from taking on the characteristics of a throwaway sheet. The positive impact on the poor of receiving a publication each week addressed to them and directed toward them will be far greater than the negative impact of receiving a free publication.

The newspaper will be supervised by one professional journalist, who will also be director of the entire Community Action News project. The editor will continually provide in-service training and supervision for his newspaper staff of three full-time assistants and twenty community stringers, but the great majority of the writing and editing will be done by indigenous personnel. The editor will constantly strive to teach effective communication through the language of the poor.

The paper will constantly try to balance its dual functions of providing information about services and opportunities, and of printing the "news" of the smaller communities and the larger county and area community.

The Informational content will include facts on how to get services, "how-to" columns on home management, child care, home repairs, discussions of legal problems, "citizen's advice column" (answers to any questions submitted by readers), man-on-the-street interviews on specific questions, a column where readers can directly request services from agencies, information on voter registration and the organization of all local political parties, information about the various CAA programs and other information features as the need arises.

The news content of the paper will include coverage of activities in various communities as reported by the community stringers, news of local government, the news of the CAA, discussions of legislation that affects the poor, school news, births, deaths and marriages, hospital notes, schedules of all events that affect the poor, and articles of general interest that are solicited and purchased from the poor.

Feature articles will focus on extensive coverage of activities in one community that have informational and educational value for other communities. Features will also spotlight new services or new uses of existing services, and occasional issues of the papers will devote extensive space to in-depth coverage of one problem that affects large numbers of the poverty-level residents of the area.

Miscellaneous features of the paper will include the active solicitation of letters to the editor, free want-ads for low-income readers, and suggestions on how the CAA or the newspaper could serve the area better.

Editorials will be signed by the writer in most cases, and will reflect only his opinions. Unsigned editorials which reflect general opinions and policies of the paper will have prior approval of the executive committee of the Corporation's Board of Directors, unless the Board delegates this authority to the editor.

The presentation of the paper's content will be almost as important as the content itself. The paper will be an eight-page tabloid and will feature a large body type—

10 and 12 point—and will emphasize the actions, pictures and names of its readers. Each of the staff members will use a Polaroid camera, and will be encouraged to take pictures whether they are printed or not, as many pictures will be needed for the bulletin boards which are described later in this proposal.

Layout will play a vital role in attracting readers. The paper must look both professional, and different. Many stories will be told mainly with pictures and headline-size sentences. Modern advertising techniques will be applied to the paper's layout to make it highly readable and attention-worthy, and some items—such as announcements of meetings and new programs or services—will be presented in the form of simulated advertisements. This type of layout philosophy is so totally foreign to area printers, that it is essential to the paper's success that all makeup be done by the paper's staff and delivered to the printer as completed dummies, ready for the production of offset printing plates. The operation of typesetting equipment and the production of completed dummies at the paper itself will also provide valuable training for low-income personnel in journalistic skills that are in critically short supply in rural areas.

This combination of public information and local news, attractive and readable presentation, and saturation circulation among the poor in the area, will reinforce the organizational efforts of the poor in a way that the conventional press has never attempted to do in this area. A noted communications expert from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, speaking to a statewide meeting of CAA directors, commented that one of the greatest effects of mass media is to reinforce the attitudes and activities of those persons and groups whose efforts are reported in the media. The content of the weekly newspaper will seek not only to reinforce community activities by reporting their news, but also to further organization and improvement efforts by providing the informational tools needed for advancement.

Each community correspondent will, in addition to his other duties, be assigned two bulletin boards that will be erected by Neighborhood Youth Corps crews at centers of community activity. These bulletin boards will carry announcements of community activities and pictures of community residents involved in CAA programs or other community self-help projects. Mimeographed materials for the bulletin boards will be produced at the newspaper office on community action subjects of interest to several communities or pertaining to the entire four-county area. County coordinators of the CAA will use the bulletin boards and help the community correspondents in keeping up-to-date materials posted on the displays. The public information staff of the North Carolina Fund has agreed to assist in the production of printed materials for the bulletin boards and to assist in developing new methods of using the displays as communications vehicles.

As the poor begin to become involved in the newspaper, and begin to respond by writing letters, asking questions and voicing complaints, the paper will serve as an important information gathering vehicle for use of the CAA. A staff member of the Human Resources Planning project—funded under a demonstration grant—will serve on the paper's Board of Directors.

One of his delegated functions will be to coordinate the planning program with the paper, and to use the newspaper's information as an indicator of how well existing CAA programs are matching the needs of the poor.

At least one Neighborhood Youth enrollee will be assigned to the paper's staff to search its columns for possible referrals to the public agency personnel. The CAA's public

information worker will also scan the paper for articles suitable for reprint in the county weeklies and in the daily press outside the area, so as to further reinforce the activities of the poor and to strengthen the communication links between the poor and the middle class. The CAA's OJT Coordinator will try to place members of the paper's staff in permanent jobs with the conventional media in the area, so as to open training opportunities on the paper to other low-income residents.

Preliminary training for newspaper personnel will be directed by the editor with the help of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina fund, which has offered its full cooperation in assisting with preliminary and in-service training. The most important training, however, will be conducted by the editor in his day-to-day supervision of the production of the paper, and in regularly scheduled in-service training sessions which he will supervise.

The editor is the logical person to supervise the entire project because of his wide contacts with the four-county area through his full and part-time newspaper staff of 23 persons. From his position he will be able to schedule and coordinate the radio units so that their work closely follows the patterns of events among the poverty-level residents of the area. Although the mobile units will attempt to cover every area of the four counties during each six weeks of their operation, it is essential to the success of the radio operation that the mobile units appear "where the action is."

3. Radio system

The radio portion of the project is more experimental in nature than the newspaper. Public information and participation projects over a long-term period using the radio medium as described in this proposal are an extreme rarity in conventional broadcasting. The techniques are used somewhat in educational FM broadcasting, but these stations reach mainly the middle and upper class audiences which own FM receivers.

The radio project will be centered in two mobile recording vans with equipment capable of producing almost any kind of radio program. Each of the vans will operate in two of the four counties and will be loosely assigned to the commercial station which broadcasts in those counties. Most of the programming produced, however, will be appropriate for broadcast on either station and will be used on both stations.

There is a possibility that a third commercial radio station will become operational in the southernmost county of the four county tier during the period of the demonstration grant, but programming for this station will consist mainly of duplication of programs produced for the two stations now in existence. This third station will add significantly to the primary coverage area of the radio programming, bringing the coverage area from 85 to approximately 95 per cent of the four county target area.

Each of the mobile units will travel to a different community each day, recording for broadcast at the community center in sight of the people, interviewing participants in work projects or CAA programs, plugging community activities, soliciting man-in-the-street interviews and questions for the citizens' advice bureau, recording the discussion and debate at community meetings, and generally allowing people to express themselves through talk or musical performances.

Form each recording session in a community will come the program material for a day's broadcasting. Questions asked by the community people will be answered on five minute radio spots. The questioner will be told at the interview when the answer to his question will be broadcast. Longer interviews, discussions, and musical performances will be broadcast on two fifteen minute seg-

ments or one thirty minute program daily on each station.

Because of the geographical characteristics of the area, it is expected that each recording team will spend at least one night a week in the northeast and southwest ends of the four counties in order to cut down on time wasted in travel, and to insure that the entire four-county area is covered thoroughly and equally.

At each recording stop, the Friendly Home Visitor (non-professional CAA health case-worker) for that area will accompany the van to take referrals. One of the jobs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee apprentice assigned to the van will be to take duplicate referrals to assure the delivery of services.

Other five-minute spots and occasional longer programs will be recorded by the broadcast developers from information gathered from public agency personnel, including the CAA. Homemakers from the Agricultural Extension Service and group workers from the CAA will provide information for shows on the preparation of commodity foods, other recipes, sewing hints and child care. CAA horticulturalists working with the Agricultural Extension Service, a delegate agency, will provide farm information. The Citizen Education Specialist of the CAA, who is a lawyer, will provide information for a legal advice program, and for programs dealing with county government and voter information. The public information worker of the CAA will provide information about CAA programs on both the county and four-county level. Most of the service information spots for one week can be recorded and edited for broadcast in an intensive half-day's work, thereby allowing the broadcast developers and their assistants to spend most of their recording time in the field.

Two of the essential elements in producing successful radio programs will be the development of attractive program formats and the compilation of extensive information files that can be used to answer questions asked in the field and to make effective referrals. Some trial and error work is anticipated in the development of suitable formats. The two radio stations involved have offered to assist in developing formats and in measuring their success. The CAA personnel and the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund will assist in providing information on service delivery and citizen education. It is expected that about three months will be required to build up to the desired programming production level of an hour a day for each station.

Programming will be presented on a combination of public service and commercial air time. Radio station WATA in Boone has offered the use of five minutes of public service time daily. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine has offered the use of fifteen minutes of public service air time daily. The owner of WTOE also indicated that attractive public service programs could be sold to commercial sponsors, thereby freeing budgeted money for the purchase of additional air time. Since the project will not be dependent on commercial sponsors for support, however, there is no possibility that commercial sponsors could influence program content. Commercial sponsorship could be an effective tool for involv-

ing part of the business community in the war on poverty, but the appropriateness of spending federal money for the development of programs which might be sponsored by commercial sponsors is a matter for decision by the funding agency. Other public service programs produced by public agencies are sponsored, and FCC regulations do not differentiate between public service time that is given free and that which is sold to sponsors.

The medium of radio by its very nature provides little opportunity for censorship as previewing of recorded material is a costly and time-consuming job. All programs will be strictly non-partisan, as required by OEO regulations and federal statutes, and the radio station owners have agreed that only partisan programs or serious breaches of libel law and good taste will be considered grounds for cancellation of program contracts.

Preliminary training for broadcast personnel will be conducted by the public information staff of the North Carolina Fund with the assistance of instructors at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, using the facilities of both institutions. Most of the training of the non-professional assistants will be conducted by the broadcast developers on the job.

The recording vans will provide physical support for community organizations, as well as public recognition. Each of the vans will carry a portable public address system that can be used either from the van or from inside a building. Other physical support equipment will be used to compare the effectiveness of various communications methods. One of the vans will carry video tape equipment that will be used to record parts of community meetings for replay in other communities. The equipment will also be used for the production of short training tapes on subjects such as: how to run a meeting, how to plan a community budget, and other subjects of interest to community organizations.

The other van will carry movie projection equipment capable of projecting films through a screen suspended from the rear of the van in daylight, and that can be used in the normal manner in a darkened building. Several existing films on community organization and service delivery will be carried as part of the van's equipment, and its crew will use a 16mm movie camera for the production of short films about local communities and for the production of news film for area television stations.

4. Financial administration

A public accountant in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to manage the financial affairs of the corporation on a contract basis. The accountant will set up the books of the corporation according to existing guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He will train and supervise the clerical staff of the corporation in bookkeeping, make all financial reports, and close the books of the project preparatory to final audit.

5. Timetable

The Community Action News Project will begin operation within five weeks after confirmation of receipt of the Demonstration grant. The project will build up to full circulation and full broadcast time within three months after it begins operations. This time table is illustrated in the table below:

Process—Time subsequent to confirmation of demonstration grant

	[In weeks]									
	1	2	3	4	5	6				17
Formation of board and incorporation of community action news	X									
Hiring and orientation of personnel	X	X	X	X	X					
Training of nonprofessional staff	X	X	X	X	X					
Process of building to full newspaper circulation and target radio broadcast level						X	X	X	X	X

D. ORGANIZATION

1. Governing body

An independent, private, non-profit corporation shall be formed to carry out the Community Action News Project.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall manage the establishment of the corporation. When the initial directors of the corporation have been selected and have assembled, elected officers, written Articles of Incorporation, written By-Laws, and received a corporate charter from the State of North Carolina, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. shall, with the concurrence of OEO, delegate the Project to this new Corporation.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall ensure that the composition of the governing body, and the by-laws of the corporation shall be consistent with the intent of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The governing body of the corporation shall be constituted as follows:

a. One representative of the local press to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors with the concurrence of the press.

b. A representative from one of the two local radio stations to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors, with the concurrence of the station's owners.

c. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action staff to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors.

d. A representative from Appalachian State Teachers College to be chosen by the College.

e. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors to be chosen by that Board.

f. Eight representatives of the poor, two from each county, to be selected by the Community Development Councils in each county.¹ Only persons with incomes below the poverty line shall be considered qualified representatives of the poor.

2. Operating organization

Subject to the corporate By-Laws and other policies to be established by the Board of Directors, and subject to the Board's regular review, the authority for the operation of the project shall be delegated to the Project Director. The Project Director shall be responsible for carrying out the work program described under section "D" of this application. Individual staff positions and duties are described below.

a. Senior Personnel

1. *Project Director*—The project director shall directly supervise the weekly newspaper and train low-income personnel in its production. He shall provide overall supervision and staff direction for the entire Community Action News project.

2. *Broadcast Developers*—(2)—The broadcast developers shall develop suitable program formats, and shall assemble, write, edit, and record in the field, materials to fit the program format. They shall arrange recording and broadcast schedules under the supervision of the project director. They shall train their low-income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and in the techniques of radio production and broadcasting, and supervise their work in the field.

b. Junior Personnel—Broadcast

1. *Technical Assistants*—(2)—These personnel shall directly assist the Broadcast Developers. They shall learn and use the skills necessary to operate recording and audio-visual equipment, and shall learn and use the techniques of radio production and announcing.

2. *Apprentices*—(2)—The apprentices shall work as trainees with each Broadcast Developer and his assistant, and shall have the specific job of monitoring recording sessions and noting requests for services or information

indicating the need for services, and referring this information to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

c. Junior Personnel—Newspaper

1. *Assistant Editor*—The assistant editor shall learn and use the techniques of assembling and editing copy, planning, layouts and writing headlines, and producing make-up dummies for offset printing.

2. *Reporters*—(2)—The reporters shall learn and use the techniques of news writing and photography, including the various skills necessary for investigative and government reporting, human interest writing, and the production of comprehensive feature stories.

3. *Clerical*—(2)—The clerical personnel shall learn and use the techniques and skills necessary for efficient secretarial work. One clerical person shall also be trained to operate Justewriter typesetting equipment and the other clerical person shall be trained in bookkeeping and proofreading.

4. *Correspondents*—(20)—Twenty local low-income persons shall be trained to accurately judge and report the news of their local communities.

5. *Apprentices*—One or more Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall be assigned to the newspaper to work as trainees with the full-time personnel. Apprentices shall have the specific job of scanning the news pages and noting requests for services or information which indicate the need of services, and referring this information on to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

E. RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROJECT

1. Expense items

a. *Project Staff*: The applicant has no particular individuals in mind for staffing the project at this time, but is confident that qualified personnel can be recruited for the professional and non-professional positions on the Project staff at the salaries indicated in the enclosed Budget.

b. *Project Equipment and Supplies*: The applicant believes that the equipment and supplies listed in the Budget can be obtained at the costs indicated without undue delay.

c. Contract services:

1. *Press*: The publisher of the *Avery Journal* in Newland, North Carolina, has agreed to print the weekly newspaper.

2. *Radio*:

a. *Radio station WATA* in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 5 minutes daily as public service time.

b. *Radio station WTOE* in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 15 minutes daily as public service time.

c. The above two stations' signals reach practically all points in the 4-county area served by the CAA which will coordinate with the Project, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., (see Exhibits B and C in the supporting materials for an illustration of geographic coverage of these radio stations.)

Although no data on listening habits are available, a 1965 survey by the North Carolina Fund revealed that out of a random sample of roughly 8% of the low-income families in the four-county area, 80% owned radios.²

3. *Financial Administration and Training*: A public accountant in Boone, N.C. Mr. Jack Williams, has agreed to handle the bookkeeping and accounting affairs of the corporation and train project personnel in any bookkeeping necessary on a contract basis if requested. The agreement with Mr. Williams is, of course, subject to the approval of the Corporation upon its establishment.

2. Nonexpense items

a. Technical Assistance:

1. *The University of North Carolina*: The Chairman of the Department of Radio, Television, and Motion Pictures of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, has offered the use of his department's radio facilities for the training of broadcast staff.

2. *The North Carolina Fund*: The director of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund, Billy E. Barnes, has offered the full use of his staff and facilities for training of newspaper and broadcast personnel, (including on-the-job training). The Fund also offers the use of citizen education programs, which it continues to develop for use with low-income persons.

b. *Supportive and Coordinating Services*: W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. offers the full cooperation of its staff in the following ways:

1. *Field Staff*: W.A.M.Y. and its delegate agencies field over 12 full-time contact workers in each county. These workers will assist the project in completing referrals, arranging programs, providing "feedback" on the impact of the project, and in compiling mailing lists for the weekly newspaper.

2. *Professional Staff*: The professional staff will assist the project in preparing service information programs and columns.

3. *Planning Staff*: The planning staff will assist in any evaluation of the project, as well as provide information on resources available to individuals and communities from all sources.

4. *Public Information Staff*: The public information staff will provide regular information on current W.A.M.Y. programs, as well as presentations prepared by its Citizen Education Specialist.

5. *Neighborhood Youth Corps*: The W.A.M.Y. Neighborhood Youth Corps project will help select and will pay enrollees who will work as apprentices in the Broadcasting Project, and will provide these with supporting services in the form of general education and counseling.

F. PHYSICAL FACILITIES REQUIRED

Approximately 3,000 square feet of indoor floor space will be required for the Project's housing. This space would provide office space for newspaper personnel and the Broadcast Developers, and for a composition room, make-up room, project room and sound editing room. Some expense (as indicated in the Budget) will have to be taken to convert floor space into specialized work areas, but the labor of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall reduce the cost of renovations. No difficulty is anticipated in finding the necessary space.

G. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation arrangements for this project will be left to the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The staff of W.A.M.Y. Community Action shall be made available to assist in evaluation upon request.

H. RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE APPLICANTS

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. has been operating anti-poverty programs since June of 1965. It is currently operating nine (9) year-round CAP components, a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation (in-school and out-of-school), an On-the-Job Training Project. It has recently begun operation of Human Resources Planning Project under a Demonstration Grant from OEO. (A copy of a Community Action Program Status Report, enclosed under Part II, Supporting Data, provides some detail in W.A.M.Y.'s CAP operations).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL

1. Senior personnel

a. *Project Director-Editor*: The editor shall have an AB degree in journalism or equivalent work experience, and shall have at least two years experience as editor of a weekly

¹ The County Community Development Councils are made up of representatives of most of the communities in each county.

² A Survey of Low-Income Families, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina. (Data not yet published.)

newspaper. He shall also have had experience in and understanding of radio broadcasting techniques.

b. Broadcast Developers: The two broadcast developers shall have BS degrees or equivalent work experience in radio production and electronics, and shall have at least two years experience in radio production and announcing, and extensive experience in field recording.

2. Junior personnel

Junior personnel shall have the talents necessary for training in their various jobs. They shall be hired by the project director from local applicants with incomes below the poverty level.

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30, 1968, GRANT PERIOD

Item A

Public accountant to serve as financial officer of Community Action News on contract basis. Accountant will open and close books, pay for audit, train project personnel in bookkeeping and handle all financial transactions of corporation \$3,000

Item C

26 Polaroid cameras at \$125----- \$3,250
1 mimeograph at \$350----- 350
1 Justowriter recorder at \$2,430----- 2,430
1 Justowriter reproducer at \$3,245----- 3,245
1 Justowriter headliner at \$825----- 825
1 Ampex video tape recorder at \$3,000----- 3,000
1 Bell & Howell 16-mm. camera at \$350----- 350
1 projection system at \$1,000----- 1,000
2 RCA electronic lecterns at \$125----- 250
2 mobile recording studios (see supplement) at \$8,969----- 17,938
2 staff vehicles at \$1,900----- 3,800
40 bulletin boards at \$30----- 1,200
8 desks at \$77----- 616
12 chairs at \$22----- 264
3 filing cabinets at \$45----- 135
1 adding machine at \$208----- 208
2 tables at \$25----- 50
Total----- 38,911

Item C supplement

2 Ford parcel delivery chassis P-350, with insulated, walk-in body, 6-cylinder, 300-cubic-inch, 170-horsepower engine at \$3,800----- \$7,600.00
2 Terado dual continental transistorized inverter, 600 watts at \$302.38----- 604.76
4 Ampex 602-4, full-track, 7.5 i.p.s. unmounted recorder, at \$575.00----- 2,300.00
2 Crown SS801, full-track 7.5-15 i.p.s., remote-controlled master studio recorder at \$1,200----- 2,400.00
2 Sparta 815 mixing console with accessory amplifiers at \$650----- 1,300.00
2 Uher 4,000 report-L field tape recorder at \$440.00----- 880.00
2 RCA 77-DX studio microphone at \$251.50----- 503.00
2 Electro-Voice 666 field microphone at \$150.00----- 300.00
2 Rek-O-Kut B-12H 3-speed turntable at \$165.00----- 330.00
2 Rek-O-Kut S-320 tone arm for above at \$34.95----- 69.90
2 GE VR-II cartridge for above with replacement stylus at \$24.95----- 49.90
Miscellaneous audio supplies and equipment----- 1,000.00
Furniture (chairs, table, lights, etc.)----- 600.00
Total----- 17,937.56

Item D

1450 Polaroid film at \$2.10----- \$3,020
150 flashbulb packs at \$1.50----- 300
2 electric typewriters (rental) at \$180----- 360
4 upright typewriters (rental) at \$90----- 364
2 portable typewriters (rental) at \$60----- 120
8 office supplies at \$180----- 1,440
4 cases Justowriter tape at \$25----- 100
50 hour video tapes at \$60----- 3,000
40 rolls 16-mm. film at \$15----- 600
400 rolls recording tape at \$1.85----- 740
Miscellaneous audio expendable supplies----- 600
Total----- 10,664

Item E

2 staff cars, 11,000 miles each at \$.08----- \$1,760
2 vans, 75 miles per day at \$.08----- 3,120
Out-of-area mileage, 3,600 miles at \$.08----- 288
Per diem, out-of-area training, 8 persons at \$12 per day for 5 days----- 480
Per diem, 100 nights for 2 recording crews at \$10 per crew per night----- 2,000
Total----- 7,648

Item F

Commercial air time, radio station WATA:
1,500 5-minute spots at \$3----- \$4,500
600 15-minute spots at \$8----- 4,800
Radio Station WTOE:
900 5-minute spots at \$3----- 2,700
600 15-minute spots at \$5----- 3,000
Printing, 8,000 copies per week at \$.0125 per copy----- 13,000
Postage, 8,000 copies per week at \$.0125 per copy----- 5,200
Article purchase, 2 articles per week at \$5 per article----- 520
Insurance, 4 vehicles----- 332
Insurance, recording equipment----- 315
Physical plant, rental of 3,000 sq. ft. at \$.05 per sq. ft.----- 1,800
Renovation----- 500
Utilities at \$75 per month----- 900
Telephone (previous experience)----- 1,800
Soundproofing, 2 vans at \$300----- 600
Equipment installation, 2 vans at \$400----- 800
Equipment maintenance, 2 vans at \$200----- 400
Total----- 41,167

Funds requested from OEO

A. Personnel:
1 Project director-editor (\$834 per month)----- \$10,000
2 Broadcast developers (\$708 per month)----- 17,000
1 Assistant editor (\$375 per month)----- 4,500
2 Reporters (\$375 per month)----- 9,000
2 Technical assistants (\$375 per month)----- 9,000
2 Clerical (\$333 per month)----- 8,000
20 Correspondents (one-fourth time) (\$65 per month)----- 15,600
8 percent benefits----- 4,600
Accounting (see attachment)----- 3,000
Subtotal----- 80,700
B. Training (not applicable)-----
C. Permanent equipment (see attachment)----- 38,911
D. Consumable supplies (see attachment)----- 10,644
E. Travel (see attachment)----- 7,648
F. Miscellaneous expenses (see attachment)----- 41,167
Total----- 179,070

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER].

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLIN] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked recently to learn that plans are being made in the mountains of North Carolina to place the Government in the newspaper business. To me, this represents a clear infringement upon the traditional American concept of a free and unfettered press as well as a violation of the inherent right of the American citizen to weigh the news of the day without encountering the taint of government-imposed thoughts and beliefs.

In asking the Office of Economic Opportunity for a grant of \$179,000 to finance this highly questionable project, the community action agency involved allegedly feels that the presence of a weekly "poverty paper" will promote group spirit. It is possible that group spirit could be achieved through the power of the press, but I submit that the inevitable and unfortunate end results of a government press far outweigh any benefits which might accrue.

Surely the fact that the Small Business Administration is prohibited from making loans to legitimate newspapers is a clear indication of congressional thinking on this subject. I cannot believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity—or, if necessary, the Congress of the United States—will permit such an obvious infringement on the American traditions of a free press.

Many others have indicated concern over this plan. It is easy to imagine the alarm of those small newspapers which find themselves threatened with government competition, but it is heartening to note that people in other areas have also expressed shock and alarm.

On May 7, 1967, the Bristol Herald Courier of Bristol, Va., carried an editorial pointing out the hidden dangers which would necessarily result from a government controlled press. I am pleased to be able to insert this editorial so that all Members may have an opportunity to study it.

The editorial follows:

AN INSIDIOUS PLAN

The "war on poverty" has taken some strange twists and turns, wasting millions of dollars in the process.

But nothing yet has been proposed which is quite as ridiculous, nor as potentially dangerous, as the project advanced by an agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the mountains of Western North Carolina.

This fuzzy-minded, frustrated agency is seeking \$179,000 to publish a weekly newspaper, in conjunction with radio broadcasts. The purpose, as best we can determine, is to convince the proud, independent mountain people of that region that they are, indeed, poverty stricken and should surrender both their pride and their independence to the Great Society.

Obviously, the OEO agency has been unable to find enough takers for the wide variety of "benefits" which it has to offer. It seems the good people of the area lack the "group spirit" and need to be indoctrinated in the virtues of the herd.

The Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey County Community Action Agency, Inc. (WAMY) complains that it has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small suc-

cess, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that the individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

And, in a remarkable bit of self-ordained righteousness, the WAMY pins much of the blame for the absence of "group spirit" on "lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism . . ." Even if true, it still is an effrontery and constitutes an intolerable judgment of religious beliefs by government.

The government, of course, nor any agency of the government, has any business publishing a newspaper for any purpose, much less one designed to mold people into preconceived patterns of life and thought.

To do so is to take the first step toward evils which attach to controlled news media, as was the case in Nazi Germany and is the case today in Soviet Russia. That such a project could be proposed is bad enough; that it may receive a sympathetic ear in Washington, is even worse. There is no place in the U.S. for a "federal press," no matter how innocuous it may appear in infancy nor how much "good" its sponsors believe it will accomplish.

That there are people who decline to accept the beneficence of federal programs is, understandably, a challenge for the Great Society. How dare they!

We wonder, though, if anyone has considered the possibility that they simply want to be let alone. Does such an attitude demand a massive government effort to convince them they are poverty-stricken and down-trodden? Is the success of a government program more important than the desire of these people to maintain their own customs, traditions and way of life, however foreign they may be to others? We think not.

The WAMY proposal for a government financed and controlled newspaper is insidious. It ought to be rejected outright by the OEO—and if it isn't, then Congress ought to lay a heavy hand on the project before it gets off the ground. This is one Great Society proposal which cannot be countenanced under any guise.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LX

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, although the administration and the Defense Department are seeking ways to better integrate compulsory military service into the fabric of American life, the idea of maintaining an entirely voluntary Army has been gaining greater acceptance because of the increasing concern over the draft's encroachment upon, and constriction of, the personal freedom of America's young men. It is in this respect, that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement signed by 77 prominent Americans urging the abolition of conscription.

LET US END CONSCRIPTION

The increased draft calls of the past two years have directed the public's attention to the need for change in the present selective service system and indeed have raised fundamental questions about the continuation of the draft itself.

Most concerned critics, ourselves included,

cite many dissatisfactions with the draft as it now stands:

1. The draft is inequitable. As a method of selection the system tends to conscript the poor and the uneducated.

2. Because the draft is compulsory, it is undemocratic. No nation can justify conscription of its citizenry except under conditions of immediate threat to its survival. It is this feature of involuntary servitude that is in direct conflict with our libertarian traditions—and is a feature we abhor among other, less democratic nations.

3. The draft tends to give the Executive Branch access to an unlimited supply of manpower—without any checks and balances or review by Congress.

4. Presently Selective Service is administered unfairly and poorly. Draft board members often have little information on considered conscripts. In addition, local draft boards operate on different standards. There is no national uniform enforcement of standards for the draft. This situation has led to many abuses, particularly in the South where some draft boards have tended to draft disproportionate numbers of Negroes.

5. The draft has been used to suppress dissent. In Ann Arbor, Michigan, several young students lost their 2S deferments for sitting-in at the Ann Arbor draft board. The young men were protesting the war in Vietnam and the draft. When questioned, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, approved of the reclassification.

6. The draft is inefficient, both economically and militarily. Many young men are drafted and sent through costly military training only to be employed in distinctly non-military tasks, e.g. cooks, clerks, dishwashers, etc. Furthermore, the draft is a military waste. Two years service is by no means sufficient for the making of a competent soldier in a highly technological age. Most conscripts leave after two years and the pay for the training of a fresh group of recruits before using the skills of the old one, is wasteful.

While we are in basic agreement with these criticisms and while we see a pressing need for change, we find ourselves deeply dismayed with two alternatives of Selective Service that are most frequently considered: A lottery and Universal National Service.

UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE

Widely suggested as an alternative to the draft is the Universal National Service proposal. Basically, Universal National Service suggests that all young men and women above a specified age be drafted and that non-military alternatives be permitted to conscripts within manpower requirements of the Department of Defense.

We cannot help but strongly object to this alternative. Universal National Service would seek to make the draft more democratic by extending conscription with all of its previously stated objectionable characteristics to all. We see true danger in conscripting an entire generation and setting it outside the framework of the democratic process for two years or more.

1. Universal National Service would not end the inequities of the present system of Selective Service, since selection for actual military duty would proceed very much on the same basis as at the present with its accompaniment of economic, class and educational differentiations. There is no question that the middle class and the college educated would seek and receive alternatives while the poor would continue to form the bulk of the fighting force.

2. While many proponents of the Universal National Service program see it as a means of solving many of America's most grave social problems, we can only feel that little will be accomplished if young people are impressed to perform humanitarian services. The success of such programs as the Peace

Corps is due to the tremendous energy and commitment of volunteers. What is more, a democratic society must not use compulsion as a means of solving its social problems.

3. Compulsory National Service is open to the strong temptation of grave governmental misuse. The temptation to employ a vast network of manpower distributed around the world and throughout the nation for the partisan advance of narrowly conceived political goals could prove irresistible to any government.

4. Persons concerned about the increasing regimentation of modern society find the Universal National Service proposal most alarming. We can only feel that mass conscription of our youth would increase the trend towards a citizenry that increasingly accepts authoritarianism as a norm.

THE LOTTERY

Thoughtful critics of the inequities of the present system have also suggested that a lottery might remedy many of the inequities inherent in the draft. While a lottery, if properly administered, might be more equitable than the present system, depending upon how deferments from the lottery were established, a lottery would still maintain the present shortcomings and dangers of the draft.

1. The lottery is only another form of compulsory service.

2. Inequities of the present draft would not be ended because deferments would still be granted to those with special skills and those pursuing training deemed in the National interest.

FOR A VOLUNTEER ARMY

It is our conclusion that both Universal National Service and the lottery contain many of the defects of the present Selective Service System and that the only forthright and equitable solution is abolition of the draft. We see only one means of correcting Selective Service and that is to abolish the draft and replace it with a volunteer army.

There are two major arguments used by critics of a volunteer army. First, these critics contend that volunteer enlistment would create a mercenary army of professionals rather than a "citizens' army." This is misleading. Before the war in Vietnam draftees accounted for less than one-third of our armed forces. Two-thirds were professionals. Thus we do not have a "citizens' army." The argument is a false one. Critics of the volunteer army fear the possibility of the development of an army elite. It should be noted that a conscript army is not more democratic.

A second criticism of the volunteer system is that it is too expensive. Salaries of military personnel would have to be raised and various incentives offered if military service is to be made attractive to potential recruits. Varying estimates have been made of the expense necessary to create the proper incentives, and present studies on this matter have been hasty and inadequate. However, a recent Defense Department study indicated that a volunteer army of 2.2-2.7 million men could be sustained without any additional incentives whatever. It is also possible to reduce military costs greatly with the institution of a volunteer army. A volunteer army would eliminate the costly need to retrain recruits every two years. Millions could be saved by the transference of civilian jobs (such as clerical and service work) now filled by conscripts, to civil service. Again the expense of combat training and turnover would be eliminated.

Critics also claim that a volunteer army would not meet the military's manpower requirements in time of crisis no matter what incentives were offered. However, we cannot believe that the young people of this nation would not rally to the defense of their country in time of national emergency.

We recommend the following steps be

taken to facilitate the transition from Selective Service to a volunteer army.

1. The institution of wages comparable to civilian pay for all enlisted men.

2. An enlargement of job-training and educational opportunities available to volunteers.

3. The turning over to civil service of all non-military tasks now performed by draftees and enlisted men.

Conscription is quickly becoming a feature of national life. Its result can only be increased militarization of our society and acceptance of authoritarianism as the norm and military solutions as a way of life. A volunteer army is economically feasible. It is incumbent on us to lift the unfair burden of conscription from our youth. Of all the possible alternatives to the draft, a volunteer army must be given the most serious considerations. It is the only alternative that is consistent with our heritage and safeguards at home and the freedoms we seek to protect abroad.

JUDGE ABRAM OTTO KANNER

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, an old friend, a distinguished legislator, an eminent judge, recently passed away in Florida—Judge Abram Otto Kanner. I came to know him when he and I were members of the House of Representatives of the Florida Legislature in 1929. He served many years thereafter as representative and senator in our legislature.

A man of keen intellect, of judicial temperament, and a symbol of noble character, he was wisely selected for the Florida bench. After serving many years as circuit judge he was elevated to the district court of appeals, our intermediate appellate court in Florida, and there he served with great dedication and distinction until his recent retirement.

At his funeral on April 16 at Stuart, Fla., Judge Kanner's longtime home, a beautiful tribute was paid to him by Rabbi Mordecai M. Thurman, of Temple Beth El, Fort Pierce, Fla. This tribute is so deserved and so beautiful that I wanted to enroll it in the RECORD of the Congress of the United States, and to commend it and the character of the noble judge and dear friend, who is its subject, to my colleagues and to my country.

IN MEMORY OF ABRAM O. KANNER, NOVEMBER 2, 1893–APRIL 13, 1967

(By Rabbi Mordecai M. Thurman, Temple Beth El, Fort Pierce, Fla.)

When Judge Abram Otto Kanner, distinguished public servant, legislator, and jurist was summoned to the Family above, death stillled a noble impulse. Our departed erected for himself an enduring memorial in the hearts of all those who were privileged to know him. His was the rare combination of keen intellect, inflexible integrity, untiring industry, and fine feeling. In the words of the psalmist, Judge Kanner "walked uprightly and spoke truth in his heart," keeping "his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking guile." We are in the presence of the mortal remains of a prince among men,

an aristocrat who journeyed through life with clean hands and a pure heart.

This kindly, quiet, unassuming, gracious gentleman filled his surrounding sphere with a pervading good. His were the virtues and joys of the hearth. His wife was his home. His religious faith was to him joy and comfort, guide and strength. He brought to the Synagogue, which he loved, a genuine religiousness and a reverent appreciation of all that is good and noble and true.

His is the imperishable crown of a good name.

We are deeply grateful for the years of his life and service. Now that God's finger has touched him and he sleeps, we feel we have surrendered something vital and uncommon to the unconquerable years.

May you who are bereaved be imbued with the faith that death does not sever the bond of devotion which unites loving hearts. Death cannot kill that which never dies. Your loving togetherness is greater than the tomb. Thank God, therefore, for the life which in His love He gave you, and which in His wisdom He has taken away. It is our fervent prayer that God may temper your heartache and grant you inner peace and serenity.

HOPE ON

There was never a day so misty and grey
That the blue was not somewhere above it;

There is never a mountain top ever so bleak
That some little flower does not love it.

There was never a night so dreary and dark
That the stars were not somewhere shining;

There is never a cloud so heavy and black
That it has not a silver lining.

There is never a waiting time, weary and long,
That will not some time have an ending;

The most beautiful part of the landscape is where
The shadows and sunshine are blending.

Upon every life some shadows will fall,
But heaven sends the sunshine of love;

Through the rifts in the clouds we may, if we will,
See the beautiful blue above.

Then let us hope on, though the way be long,
And the darkness be gathering fast;

For the turn in the road is a little way on,
Where the home lights will greet us at last.

NORTHWEST TOWN PIONEER DAYS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Richard J. Daley, the outstanding mayor of Chicago, Ill. has proclaimed the period from May 15 through May 20 as Northwest Town Pioneer Days.

This period has been set aside by the mayor in order that appropriate observances may be held of the 130th anniversary of the Near Northwest Side, one of the most interesting and exciting neighborhoods in Chicago.

The festivities which have been scheduled will focus attention on 130 years of progress made by this community, and will include a torchlight parade on May 26. All the religious, civic, business, and industrial groups will participate in the

parade and in the other activities which have been scheduled.

The 130th anniversary program is being sponsored by the Chicago-Ashland Business Men's Association, an organization devoted to serving the community, and the Community Advertiser, a leading neighborhood newspaper which has served for years as a voice of the community under the capable and inspired guidance of its publisher, Mr. Arthur Schimmel.

Mr. Wayne Dunkel, manager of Goldblatt's Department Store, is serving as chairman, and Mr. Mort Miller, of Mort Miller, Inc., and president of the Chicago-Ashland Business Men's Association, is cochairman of the event. The committee members include Milton Kaplan, Don Esrig, Jot Friedland, John Lythke, Eduardo Pacheco, Irving Lamet, Al Dorenfest, Abraham Cohen, Leonard Wald, Isadore Finkelstein, Irwin W. Mendlesohn, Al Piet, Ralph Credio, Harold Pikeo, Mrs. Wanda Skalski, Joseph Zilka, Lou Kwasman, Mrs. Sophie Aron, Paul Grossman, Edward Howaniec, Meyer Hirst, Charles Dexter, Robert Mendez, Roy Garwood, Vanta Coda, Al Moss, James H. Newmark, Larry Bell, Max Cohen, Sam Weiss, and Edward Zable.

By their contributions and their efforts, I know that the hard-working and dedicated members of the committee, together with all of the members of the community who are participating in the Near Northwest Pioneer Days, will make this event a tremendous success. I commend all of them for their community spirit and their best efforts in the public interest.

I am particularly proud of the outstanding progress that the Near Northwest Side has made because it is located in the Seventh District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

I am, therefore, pleased to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the mayor's proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the City of Chicago is this year observing the 130th Anniversary of its incorporation; and

Whereas, in this connection the people of the admirably progressive Near Northwest Side area are planning observances which will emphasize particularly the development of this section in consonance with the great growth of Chicago as a whole; and

Whereas, this local celebration of the city's anniversary of incorporation will be under the general direction of the Chicago-Ashland Businessmen's Association and the Community Advertiser:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim the period from May 15 through May 20, 1967 to be Northwest Town Pioneer Days and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 2nd day of March, A.D., 1967.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

TRIP TO AFRICA IS A NECESSITY

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I read with much interest the editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "This Trip Is Necessary." It deals with the forthcoming trip to Africa of Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, who will be accompanied by Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs J. Wayne Fredericks.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Wayne Fredericks. I have found him to be one of our most knowledgeable and informed experts in the Bureau of African Affairs at the State Department, and I most certainly subscribe to the Times editorial that his achievements over the past several years have been considerable.

His contributions as a public servant have been outstanding, and I would hope that neither the President nor the Secretary of State would permit him to leave the Department—a possibility mentioned in the editorial. His services are too necessary to the country and to the public, and I look forward to a continued association with him as one of those gifted individuals with the foresight to know what our foreign policy should be, and the devotion and persistence to carry such policy through to fruition.

At this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth the editorial from the New York Times of May 9, 1967.

THIS TRIP IS NECESSARY

The trip to eleven African countries on which Under Secretary of State Katzenbach starts tomorrow will be the first such swing through Africa by anyone from State's top layer. The trip is long overdue.

Mr. Katzenbach's job will not be easy. He will try to persuade leaders of the new Africa that the United States is not disengaging from the continent, that Washington remains interested in their problems and opposed to perpetuation of white minority rule in southern Africa.

He will be called on to explain how the United States, on one side, can take strong stands against the white rebel regime in Rhodesia and against South Africa's flouting of the United Nations in South West Africa and, on the other, can approve such a spectacular goodwill gesture toward Pretoria as the visit of the carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt to Capetown.

The Under Secretary's trip to an area entirely avoided to date by the most traveled Secretary of State in our history is a tribute to the persistence of J. Wayne Fredericks, Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. In accompanying Mr. Katzenbach, Mr. Fredericks may be performing a last public service before returning to private life.

In five years of hard work he has done much to persuade the State Department's seventh floor that Africa exists and will not go away—a considerable achievement.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE ILLS OF OUR MAIL DELIVERY SYSTEM

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster O'Brien's proposal to convert the Post Office into a non-profit Government corporation was the catalyst for a nationwide wave of editorial comment on the ills of our mail delivery system. Most of the editorials praised the Postmaster General for his forthright comments, and rightfully so. He has made a bold, thought-provoking recommendation that deserves, and is receiving, full consideration in both the legislative and executive branches of Government.

However, in their haste to blame someone for the manifold problems our postal service is heir to, some editorial writers have decided that the Congress is the principal, if not the sole, culprit. They have even implied that the Postmaster General has come to the same conclusion. These newspapers are incorrect on both points. The Congress is not responsible for the admittedly serious postal problems that now exist in our country. Nor did our very able and astute Postmaster General ever even suggest anything of the kind.

To the contrary, in the speech before the Magazine Publishers Association, in which he proposed a postal corporation, Mr. O'Brien said our postal problems are rooted in history. Here is what the Postmaster General said, and I quote:

Permit me to say loud and clear that I am not focusing any criticism on Congress for the manner in which the Postal Service is organized. Our organization is the product of evolution, and I think any candid assessment of the record will show that whenever ready progress has been made during that revolutionary process, Congressional prodding has had much to do with it.

It is always more convenient if a handy villain can be found. But as Mr. O'Brien has pointed out, there is no villain in this piece—unless you can call a system that has failed to respond to the needs of the times a villain.

Let me emphasize that most of the editorials I have seen have been constructive and have reflected an awareness of the complexities involved in Mr. O'Brien's proposal.

But all the editorials, even those which insist that what ails the Post Office is Congress, and nothing more, contribute to the important national dialog now underway. With permission, I will insert in the RECORD excerpts from editorials on the postal service from California and other States throughout the Nation.

Los Angeles Times:

Final judgments cannot be made until the details are spelled out. But it appears that O'Brien has come up with an imaginative and practical approach to averting the threatened breakdown in mail service.

President Johnson should seriously consider endorsing the proposal and sending it on to Congress for action.

The Sun, San Bernardino, Calif.:

The conclusion of the experts apparently is that Congress is going to have to give up some of its rigid control over the postal sys-

tem. Pulling out tradition is even more difficult than pulling teeth, but congressmen have had their warning.

Congress was not designed to be an administrative body, and that is what has ailed the Post Office for these many years.

Independent Star-News, Pasadena, Calif.:

Congress currently has before it a \$700 million mail rate increase and a \$100 million crash mechanization program. Both are necessary, but will only momentarily shore up the department's sagging efficiency.

The entire problem is in need of urgent study. O'Brien's proposal may be too drastic or not drastic enough. It even has been suggested that postal rates be done away with entirely and the post office be run completely as a public service. The obvious drawbacks to this solution put it in the realm of impossibility, but it may be more realistic than many other plans being given serious consideration.

News Tribune, Fullerton, Calif.:

The postmaster general may not have the perfect answer to the problem, but at least he has provided a starting point for serious discussions of remedial action. Congress ought to pick up the ball.

The Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.:

The calamity of postal operations has been so dramatically exposed by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien that it should be obvious emergency treatment is vital.

The Tuscaloosa News, Tuscaloosa, Fla.:

Postmaster General O'Brien's proposal for replacing the present department with a public service corporation deserves serious study and consideration. And above all, the plight of the nation's postal system demands public interest and understanding.

We cannot continue to run a space age postal service with pony express policies and practices.

The Minneapolis Star, Minneapolis, Minn.:

O'Brien has sprung a bold and exciting idea. The change would be titanic, and the proposal will be hashed over for a long time. Even if it doesn't succeed as presented, the idea should be the avenue to lesser reform.

Ogden Standard-Examiner, Ogden, Utah:

This has promise of being the course long needed to get the U.S. Post Office Department out of the doldrums and on its way to handling mail faster, more efficiently and cheaper.

Best of all, it could—and should—get the postal service out of politics.

News-Sun, Waukegan, Ill.:

Some people may ask why the department isn't completely divorced from government and turned over to private enterprise. On the surface, this is a reasonable question. However, in order to run the system on an unswerving profit-and-loss basis, private enterprise would have to heavily increase mail rates to stay consistently in the black. The post office was never meant to operate strictly by the balance sheet, but to help promote the general welfare and to advance the economy. It does so in many ways—such as distributing books, periodicals and other publications at a subsidized rate. Small, but useful publishing companies could be driven out of business if they had to pay sky-high mail charges.

Press Citizen, Iowa City, Iowa:

The alternative appears to be continued division of decision-making and veto powers

among the administration. Congress, postal unions and mail users' associations. This blocks efficient management, so we can expect to have continued rate increases in an effort to hold a deteriorating system together. Someday, however, things are likely to get so bad that the government corporation idea, or something like it, will come through public demand.

The Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah:

The O'Brien plan is too radical a departure from the present system to be endorsed—or rejected—out of hand. But the O'Brien plan should not be laid on the shelf, as has happened with so many other ideas for the improvement of government services. On the contrary, the plan could well be used as the starting point for a searching study of the Post Office. The department has been described as one of the nation's biggest "businesses." If so, it should be operated like one.

The Roanoke Times, Roanoke, Va.:

It's a spectacular plan. It might work, it might not. But unless Congress can come up with something better, it seems worth a try. In fact, almost anything might be preferable to a system that is still trying to recover from the near-fatal breakdown of mail distribution that occurred in the Midwest last year.

The Columbus Ledger, Columbus, Ga.:

As we said, the idea should not be shot down before there's time for a complete study. Mr. O'Brien's proposed solution might not be the right and appropriate one. But, at least, it should be given the benefit of study. For one way or another, something is going to have to give in the operation of the postal service. It is growing into an unmanageable monster.

Journal Herald, Dayton, Ohio:

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's radical proposal to overhaul the U.S. mail system is welcome.

The Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa.:

The O'Brien proposal may not get very far. Congress is jealous of its power to fix postal rates. Moreover, many members of Congress contend that the Founding Fathers intended the Post Office Department to constitute a public service and not necessarily a self-supporting institution. But at least Mr. O'Brien has advanced an idea that is certain to stir up a lot of debate.

North Adams Transcript, North Adams, Mass.:

The most intriguing—and refreshing—idea to come from Washington in a long time was Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's plan to abolish the present postal system and replace it with a non-profit government corporation.

Adirondack Daily Enterprise, Saranac Lake, N.Y.:

Two business communities benefit from the post office and, in our view, unnecessarily. One is the newspaper industry and the second is the industry that produces so-called "junk" mail and the businesses that use that form of advertising.

At every meeting of publishers, whether of newspapers or magazines, there is a valiant defense of the present low rates for publications, rates which cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

The original purpose of this low rate was the freedom of the press. But this was the only medium of communications, more than a century and a half before radio or television. We find it ridiculous to insist that the freedom of the press requires that the federal government should deliver either The

Enterprise or Time and Life magazines at a cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

News-Register, Wheeling, W. Va.:

So it was good to hear the splendid proposal by Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien a couple of weeks ago whereby he would abolish the Post Office Department as a part of the Cabinet, and turn it into a non-profit corporation operated by a board of directors and managed by a professional executive appointed by the board. Certainly the idea offers something better than continual postal deficits, poor service and higher rates.

CREDIT UNION LEGISLATION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives today voted, with my full and complete support, to report the bill H.R. 9682, which would liberalize the rules under which officers, directors, and members of supervisory and credit committees of Federal credit unions may borrow from their own credit unions.

Many credit unions, particularly smaller ones, have found present law a handicap to obtaining and holding the services of qualified officials. I am glad that this needed legislation is starting to move in the Congress of the United States.

MISSILES

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like next to discuss the Army's fiscal year 1968 program for the procurement of missiles, and repair parts, for which authorization is also sought.

The total cost of this program is \$769.2 million, or approximately 13 percent of the PEMA budget for fiscal year 1968. The program as presented will provide for the introduction of the Tow missile, and for the continued procurement of the Chaparral, Redeye, Lance, and Shillelagh missile systems, as well as for the enhancement of the capabilities of other existing systems.

Tow is a tube-launched, optically tracked, wire-guided missile designed for use by the infantryman to destroy enemy tanks, armored vehicles, and pillboxes. It is crew-portable and can be mounted on either a light vehicle, such as the Mule, Jeep, and armored personnel carrier, or fired from the ground. Its range, accuracy, and ease of operation greatly exceed those of the Entac missile and 106-mm. recoilless rifle which it replaces.

Chaparral is a ground-to-air adaptation of the Navy and Air Force air-to-air Sidewinder. The missile launcher is mounted on a full-tracked, self-propelled carrier, affording a high degree of mobility and maneuverability. The system, when operational, will provide low-altitude defense against enemy aircraft in forward combat areas.

Redeye is a man-transportable, shoulder-fired, guided missile developed for use by frontline combat units for close-in air defense. It is being procured for both the Army and the Marine Corps.

Lance is a lightweight, highly mobile, surface-to-surface missile system designed to provide nuclear as well as conventional firepower. Lance will replace Honest John, providing improved accuracy, range, and mobility. Lance may be launched from a modified full-tracked personnel carrier, which serves as both transporter and launcher, or from a lightweight towed launcher.

Shillelagh is a command guided missile which is fired from a gun tube that is also capable of firing conventional ammunition. It is a direct-fire, surface-to-surface missile for attack of moving or stationary targets. The Shillelagh system, with its 152-mm. gun launcher, will comprise the principal armament on the Army's new armored reconnaissance/airborne assault vehicle, XM551—General Sheridan—and the M60A1E1-M60A1E2 tank.

The program includes \$269 million for the procurement and manufacture of long lead-time components for the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile defense system. This is the second year increment and, together with \$153.5 million authorized in fiscal year 1967, constitutes the required amount to begin Nike X procurement should a decision be made to provide a ballistic missile defense for the United States.

Other missile program costs include the purchase of additional target missiles; production base support; procurement of additional towed Hawk tactical and maintenance float sets, and self-propelled training equipment items; the procurement of improved Pershing ground support equipment to better perform the Quick Reaction Alert role; and funds for the land combat support system—LCSS—and electronic, automatic, multi-purpose assembly of test and repair equipment for use in maintaining the Shillelagh, Tow, and Lance missile systems in the field.

Missile parts, at a dollar value of \$37.9 million, are programmed for initial provisioning and replenishment.

EDWARD P. MORGAN SAYS "MIS-GUIDED REPUBLICAN SCHEME THREATENS SCHOOL AID"

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one

of the ablest commentators on public affairs in our country is Edward P. Morgan of the ABC radio network.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column excerpted from Mr. Morgan's broadcast. The column is entitled, "Misguided Republican Scheme Threatens Federal School Aid."

**MISGUIDED REPUBLICAN SCHEME THREATENS
FEDERAL SCHOOL AID**

(By Edward P. Morgan)

Two years ago, for the first time in the nation's history, Congress began to provide federal aid to grade schools and high schools.

It was a massive belated blood transfusion against the educational anemia that has afflicted especially America's poor like an endemic disease for generations. This was no miracle drug and there were some mistakes in its application. But its needle was aimed at the right target: the vicious circle of ignorance in which the nation's needy are trapped. To improve themselves they need jobs. But to get and hold jobs they need training. In the past educational opportunities open to them have been strikingly limited, shockingly inferior and for the most part they have not been able to afford the extra training necessary to develop more than manual labor skills demanded by an increasingly specialized and mechanized economy.

But this national help to the grass roots was a bright beginning to combat the blight. The bogeyman raised in the frightened, prejudiced minds of some of a big government brainwashing the population by dictating school curricula turned out to be a limp scarecrow.

Admittedly there has been some bureaucratic imperiousness and more red tape than necessary. Give an official the opportunity to circulate a form and he all too often is inclined to attach more importance to the form than the substance. This, of course, proves Parkinson's Law, that the more blanks there are to fill out, the emptier the efficiency.

The ingeniousness of the school aid legislation, however, lay in its ability to clear two bigger obstacles: the antagonisms of race and religion. It was a must, of course, that the federal law provide equality of educational benefits to Negro children. The constitutional separation of church and state foreclosed the possibility of earmarking tax dollars for parochial schools, as such. Some state constitutions forbid outright public aid to church-supported schools. No federal money now goes directly to private or parochial schools.

The compromise came through by-passing the category of the school, in effect, and considering the category of need of the principal objective of the whole exercise, the child. The result has been a new-found cooperation between government officials and public and private school officials at a local level to provide children who have never had them before such things as remedial reading, a guidance counselor or a hot breakfast.

But now this whole intricate apparatus is in danger of being swept away through a sinister combination of misguided Republican ingenuity and the vindictiveness of some diehard segregationists smarting under federal compulsion—13 years after the Supreme Court decision—to integrate public schools.

Without committee hearings, GOP Rep. Albert Quile (Minn.) has introduced—and changed it hastily several times—an amendment to the elementary and secondary education act which would substitute block grants to states for aid now going to local communities. On the surface this seems a reasonable projection of the "creative federalism" the Johnson Administration has talked so much about.

Beneath the surface, however, the Quile

amendment is a booby-trap. Mobilizing support from conservatives by its philosophy of tax-sharing to counterbalance "too much federal control," its formula would allocate funds to states on the basis of the relative number of school-age children and the relative income per child in each state.

The ironic flaw in this arithmetic is that it would hurt both the poorest and the richest states. All the southern and border states—except Maryland—would get less money and these are states which already are among the lowest in per-pupil expenditure for education. But New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey and Texas would be injured too. With big populations they have some of the largest numbers of educationally-deprived children in school who need more financial help.

That's not all. Funds for that political orphan, the District of Columbia, would be cut almost in half. (Tests just released show that students in four out of five District schools are poor readers and below the national average.)

The Quile amendment also would jeopardize if not wipe out school aid to migrant workers' children, American Indians, and dependents of government workers overseas. It would further weaken the fledgling Teacher Corps as well as deprive handicapped and/or delinquent children whom federal school funds now help.

The Leadership Conference, an influential civil rights lobby, opposes the amendment, fearing that in a spite-the-face mood, the South will prefer to cut off the nose of present federal funds and accept less under the Quile formula in order to continue the blind fight for "states' rights."

A mixture of misunderstanding, prejudice and complacency could allow the Quile amendment to reverse the progress in primary and secondary education. In a recent speech, one of the nation's most valuable public servants, Health, Education and Welfare Sec. John Gardner, said:

"I understand the love of complacency. But down that path lies the decay and ruin of this great nation."

**AFL-CIO CALLS FOR BIPARTISAN
SUPPORT OF ELEMENTARY AND
SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
(H.R. 7819)**

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the list of those concerned with the education of American children who have endorsed continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is growing daily. The AFL-CIO Executive Council has now joined the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Parents Committee, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and a host of others in endorsing continuation of the present, successful program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary school children.

As the AFL-CIO statement points out, the Quile substitutes were "never considered by any congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819."

Mr. Speaker, the statement goes on to point out that the Quile substitutes have been amended substantially several times. The AFL-CIO says four times, but I have lost exact count at this point. This is no way to legislate in such an important area as the education of American children.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7819 "includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens the ESEA." These are the conclusions of the AFL-CIO Executive Council. I urge my colleagues to read the full statement.

**STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE
COUNCIL ON SUPPORT OF THE ELEMENTARY
AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1967**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been hailed widely and correctly as historic legislation providing a breakthrough in the area of federal aid to education.

Today, this legislation is in serious jeopardy. The AFL-CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress shall not be destroyed.

Despite support for the continuation of ESEA from every major educational organization, the vast majority of state school superintendents, local school districts, and the non-public school organizations, the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has chosen to make this vital legislation a partisan political issue.

Waving the banner of "federal control," this Republican leadership is seeking to wipe out ESEA and substitute a form of financial block grants to the states. In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice.

Over eight million educationally deprived children in virtually all of the country's 23,000 school districts already have received direct benefits under ESEA. This far-reaching law has established a national policy directed at meeting the special needs of the educationally poor.

As proposed by Rep. Albert Quile (R. Minn.), the Republican substitute would permit the states to ignore this national policy. It would, instead, permit the individual states to practice economic discrimination.

Block grants can only intensify the present financial conflicts between the large cities and respective state governments. Programs developed at the state level can provide no federal guarantee that funds will go where they are most needed—to help the children of the slums and the rural depressed areas.

The block grant approach also threatens to rekindle the flames of controversy over the state-church issue that frustrated enactment of federal aid to education for over 20 years. Private school organizations are deeply concerned that their students will no longer be able to participate in many federal programs if these programs are administered by state departments of education.

But there is much more that is wrong with the Quile substitute.

The substitute was never considered by any Congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819.

The allocation formula as now spelled-out in the Quile substitute provides half the states with less funds than they would receive under H.R. 7819. These are the states most in need: those with low per pupil expenditures and those with the largest number of youths living in poverty.

The original Quile proposal has now been amended four times in an effort to gain new

political support. Rep. Quie has modified his block grant approach to provide that at least 50 percent of a state's grant be used for the educationally disadvantaged. Under H.R. 7819, however, 80 percent of the federal funds must be used for this purpose.

The Quie substitute also prohibits the use of such funds for general classroom construction and improved teacher salaries, while—at the same time—eliminating provisions for such successfully operating programs as the Teacher Corps, aid for the children of migrant workers, foster children, and many others.

The Quie substitute also has a detrimental effect on civil rights. The elimination of "federal control" will not make it easier to enforce desegregation guidelines. A cut-back in funds to the cities will punish severely the economically poor children of minority groups.

The Quie substitute would reduce by \$281 million fiscal 1969 authorizations provided in H.R. 7819. No such reduction is justified.

H.R. 7819, in direct contrast to the Quie substitute, continues the popular programs born in 1965 that have earned wide public and Congressional support. The bill includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens ESEA, instead of destroying it as proposed by Quie.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council is convinced that the education of our youth is too important to be dragged into the partisan, political arena. We are confident that many Republican members of the House of Representatives share these views.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council, therefore, urges the members of both parties in the House to join together in rejecting the Quie substitute and giving bipartisan support to H.R. 7819—a continuation of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

BOSTON GLOBE URGES DEFEAT OF QUIE BILL

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive editorial comments I have seen about the proposed amendments of Representative ALBERT QUIE to do away with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was published in the Boston Globe of May 1, 1967.

The Boston Globe, like the New York Times and the Washington Post, becomes one more significant voice in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 7819).

The editorial follows:

SCHOOL AID DIVERSIONS

The "Republican plan" for revamping the administration's elementary and secondary education program would carry more weight if its principal backers were not men who had voted up, down and across against practically every aid-to-education bill which has come up in the past decade.

The amendment which Rep. Albert Quie of Minnesota has offered on behalf of twelve G.O.P. colleagues is a serious one. It accepts the fact that Federal aid to education is here to stay. But by substituting block grant appropriations to the states for the present system of allocations by categories it would

take most of the punch and effectiveness out of the Federal program.

HEW Secretary John W. Gardner summed the situation up when he said: "The Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs."

It would also eliminate important Federal safeguards. Southern Democrats are rallying behind the amendment in the belief that it would scratch Federal guidelines on discrimination. There is no doubt that it would sharply curtail Federal control over the kind of programs to be aided. It might reopen the old controversy over church-school aid.

Congress should forget these diversions and get back on the track.

A BILL FOR THE LONG-TERM CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN OUR COUNTRY'S PRIME ASSET: OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the country's greatest asset is its people and particularly its youth. And I for one sincerely believe that the best investment in our youth, as well as our country, is to encourage and provide for their education, particularly higher education. I refer here to education beyond the high school level, not just college, but also accredited business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. The Federal Government is presently encouraging this in a number of ways; but, to date, we have failed to squarely face the high cost of acquiring this level of education. To meet this situation I am introducing a bill to allow a credit against income tax for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education.

The bill provides an income tax credit on the first \$1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institution of higher education, including business and trade schools. The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first \$300, 50 percent of the next \$200, and 25 percent of the next \$1,000. The maximum credit allowable for any one student is \$575. The tax credit is available to anyone who pays tuition expenses.

Anyone financing more than one student, a parent with two children in college or business school, for example, could get a credit of this amount for each child; it is available to other relatives; it is available to students who are working to put themselves through school and pay their own expenses; and it is available to those who would like to help deserving students.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the cost of education in general and particularly going to college, business, or trade school has risen and will continue to rise. The present programs which help those desiring to further their education are inadequate and insufficient to meet the needs of the majority of American fami-

lies. As the costs of education continue to rise, the burden will continue to fall the hardest on the lower and middle income groups—who are struggling to pay bills, buy their homes, and educate their children. This bill is designed to provide direct help to those in the lower and middle income groups in the United States.

It is in the national interest that the Congress recognize this need for furthering the education of our people. Increasing one's education generally increases one's earning power—so this would be, in effect, a long-term, capital investment in our country's prime asset and future. Just as some tax relief is recognized for such items as large medical bills and property loss or damage, so must there be some relief for the high cost of education.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the future of the food stamp program. Recent action taken by the House Agriculture Committee by amending H.R. 1318 to increase State participation in the cost of the program by 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons will, in my opinion, place the program in great jeopardy. I fear that many States, including my own of New York, will be forced to discontinue the program. Those who need the program—persons in the lowest income brackets and those on public assistance—will suffer. The program has been an important one in combating poverty and in permitting these people adequate amounts of proper food.

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose the committee action to limit fund authorization through fiscal 1967. The bill, as introduced, had provided for open-end authorization. Without the need for new authorization by Congress each year, I think this provision should be restored to H.R. 1318.

The food stamp program, put into effect by Public Law 525 of the 88th Congress, authorized appropriations for 3 years through June 30 of this year. The program requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food, and provides them with the opportunity to buy more and better food for less money. This is not a welfare program. There is no reason for any citizen of this country of great abundance and food surplus to go hungry or to lack a proper, nutritious diet.

Although the food stamp program is not yet in operation in New York City, it has been in operation in other sections of New York State. We have requested the program for New York City for fiscal 1968 and, hopefully, the Department of Agriculture will give approval if State funds are available to match

Federal funds. It is estimated that more than 200,000 will benefit if it goes into effect. However, at the projected level of the program for next year, the amendment to add the 20 percent assessment will cost my State \$6 million for the food stamp program—an increase of \$4.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, 41 States and the District of Columbia support the food stamp program. More than 2 million low-income, needy families throughout the country are being assisted. Many other States, just as my State of New York, have indicated that they desire to initiate the program. I want to go on record as strongly opposing H.R. 1318, as amended and reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. The States participating in the program and those wishing to participate should not be penalized by a burdensome 20-percent additional cost.

When H.R. 1318 comes to the House floor I will support an amendment to eliminate the 20-percent assessment, and I will also support an amendment to restore open-end authorization.

SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO Executive Council has added its voice to the rising chorus of opponents of the Quile substitute for the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The statement adopted by the executive council is a good summary of the major arguments against the substitute, and I urge Members of Congress to take a few minutes to read it.

Like many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I have been committed for years to the proposition that there is a national interest in improving the quality and quantity of education available to the young people of America. And it is the responsibility of Congress to legislate in that national interest.

It took years of hard work and preparation by many Americans—in and out of Congress—to enact finally the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Although I do not believe the act is perfect, I am very proud to have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was put together and finally reported for action by the full House. I think each of us who served in the last Congress and who supported this landmark legislation can be proud of the programs it authorized. It represents a good foundation upon which to build.

Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been good for America. The Education and Labor

Committee has reported a good bill to extend and expand this program, and I hope Members of the House will support the committee bill and oppose the Quile substitute.

For the information of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert the statement adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments to be printed as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON SUPPORT OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1967

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been hailed widely and correctly as historic legislation providing a breakthrough in the area of federal aid to education.

Today, this legislation is in serious jeopardy. The AFL-CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress shall not be destroyed.

Despite support for the continuation of ESEA from every major educational organization, the vast majority of state school superintendents, local school districts, and the non-public school organizations, the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has chosen to make this vital legislation a partisan political issue.

Waving the banner of "federal control," this Republican leadership is seeking to wipe out ESEA and substitute a form of financial block grants to the states. In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice.

Over eight million educationally deprived children in virtually all of the country's 23,000 school districts already have received direct benefits under ESEA. This far-reaching law has established a national policy directed at meeting the special needs of the educationally poor.

As proposed by Rep. Albert Quile (R., Minn.), the Republican substitute would permit the states to ignore this national policy. It would, instead, permit the individual states to practice economic discrimination.

Block grants can only intensify the present financial conflicts between the large cities and respective state governments. Programs developed at the state level can provide no federal guarantee that funds will go where they are most needed—to help the children of the slums and the rural depressed areas.

The block grant approach also threatens to rekindle the flames of controversy over the state-church issue that frustrated enactment of federal aid to education for over 20 years. Private school organizations are deeply concerned that their students will no longer be able to participate in many federal programs if these programs are administered by state departments of education.

But there is much more that is wrong with the Quile substitute.

The substitute was never considered by any Congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819.

The allocation formula as now spelled-out in the Quile substitute provides half the states with less funds than they would receive under H.R. 7819. These are the states most in need: those with low per pupil expenditures and those with the largest number of youths living in poverty.

The original Quile proposal has now been amended four times in an effort to gain new political support. Rep. Quile has modified his block grant approach to provide that at least

50 percent of a state's grant be used for the educationally disadvantaged. Under H.R. 7819, however, 80 percent of the federal funds must be used for this purpose.

The Quile substitute also prohibits the use of such funds for general classroom construction and improved teacher salaries, while—at the same time—eliminating provisions for such successfully operating programs as the Teacher Corps, aid for the children of migrant workers, foster children, and many others.

The Quile substitute also has a detrimental effect on civil rights. The elimination of "federal control" will not make it easier to enforce desegregation guidelines. A cutback in funds to the cities will punish severely the economically poor children of minority groups.

The Quile substitute would reduce by \$281 million fiscal 1969 authorizations provided in H.R. 7819. No such reduction is justified.

H.R. 7819, in direct contrast to the Quile substitute, continues the popular programs born in 1965 that have earned wide public and Congressional support. The bill includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens ESEA, instead of destroying it as proposed by Quile.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council is convinced that the education of our youth is too important to be dragged into the partisan, political arena. We are confident that many Republican members of the House of Representatives share these views.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council, therefore, urges the members of both parties in the House to join together in rejecting the Quile substitute and giving bipartisan support to H.R. 7819—a continuation of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

REMARKS OF SENATOR TALMADGE AT GEORGIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STUCKEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Georgia Chamber of Commerce has been honoring the staff members of our Congress with an annual dinner to show appreciation for the loyal diligence of these men and women who assist the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in serving their constituents.

And, each year, the members of the Georgia delegation and their staff look forward to the fine dinner which is held by our outstanding chamber of commerce.

At this year's annual dinner, we had the pleasure of hearing from our distinguished Senator, the Honorable HERMAN E. TALMADGE, as he addressed the more than 500 people present.

I believe that Senator TALMADGE's remarks concerning civil disobedience and free speech are particularly pertinent at this time; a time when crime is on the increase in our country. I would therefore, like to include Senator TALMADGE's remarks at this dinner in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate and House:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE AT THE GEORGIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, MAY 1, 1967

We are again indebted to the Georgia State Chamber of Commerce for an evening of good food and excellent company. I know that I speak for all the Georgia Congressional Delegation in saying that this annual event is indeed a highlight of the year.

And our great appreciation is matched by that of our staffs. For it is their night, too. This is an opportunity for us to take off our hats to the men and women in our offices and thank them for a job well done. You may or may not be aware of the fact, that these are very hard-working and dedicated people.

It is to the credit of our state that there is not a harder-working or more devoted group of people on Capitol Hill than the staff members of the Georgia Congressional Delegation.

For us in the Senate and the House of Representatives to try to conduct our business without them would be like trying to function with one arm tied behind us—our right arms in most cases.

I am reminded of the apprentice plumber who spent most of his time on the job mumbling and grumbling about how hard the work was. Finally, one of the old-timers had enough.

"Look sonny," he told the boy, "you just don't know how easy things is nowadays. Back in the old days when I was starting out, the boss would let us put down the first two lengths of pipe . . . and then he would turn the water on . . . and we would have to stay ahead of it."

Well, that's pretty much the way it is a lot of the time in our offices. And somehow or other, our people manage to stay ahead of the flow of mail, telephone calls and constituent requests of all kinds.

Speaking of my constituents, I read in the paper the other day that I was out of touch with the people. Then I read the next day that I was back in touch again. All this may be, and I may have been out of touch with the people. But judging from the mail, visits, and personal telephone calls I get, the people haven't been out of touch with me.

You know, keeping in touch with the people is just one of many of the trials and tribulations of political life. It goes a little like this:

If you try to please the people, you're a demagogue. If you don't you're a poor public servant. If you aspire to higher office or reelection, you're ambitious and greedy. If you don't, you have no brains and no ability.

If you get written up in the press, you are a publicity hound and headline hunter. If you don't, you're a do-nothing politician. If you speak up and express your views, you are a loud-mouth and a show-off. If you don't, you don't know what is going on.

Nothing is very simple any more—not nearly so simple and straight to the point as this masterpiece on anatomy written by a sixth-grade boy. He wrote:

"Your head is kind of round and hard, and your brains are in it, and your hair is on it. Your face is the front of your head where you eat and make faces. Your neck is what keeps your head out of your collar. It's hard to keep clean.

"Your stomach is something that if you don't eat often enough, it hurts . . . and spinach don't help it none. Your spine is a long bone in your back that keeps you from folding up. Your back is always behind you no matter how quick you turn around.

"Your arms you got to have to reach the butter, and your fingers stick out of your hands so you can add up arithmetic. Your legs is what you got to have two of to get to get to first base. Your feet are what you run on, and your toes are what you always get stubbed.

"And that's all there is of you except what's inside, and I never saw it."

You don't run across pure simplicity like that much any more, especially not in Washington . . . where you hear a lot of people say that an elephant is a mouse built to Government specifications.

Did you know that the Ten Commandments contain 297 words, the Bill of Rights is set forth in 463 words, and the Gettysburg Address had 266 words.

Then there was a recent Federal Directive to regulate the price of cabbage that took 26,911 words.

I was struck by this story the other day. It seems that this drunk was sitting in a bar around here very busy scribbling down some figures on a piece of paper.

The bartender got curious and asked him what he was doing.

"Well, it's like this," replied the drunk, "My wife is on a diet and she told me she is losing four pounds a week."

"So what?" said the bartender.

"Well, if my figures are correct," the man explained, "I'll be rid of her completely in 23 months."

On a more serious note, I want to say a few things tonight about something that I know to be of great concern to you and people throughout the country.

And that is: What we have been witnessing in recent months in the name of so-called civil disobedience and free speech.

Warm weather is here again. The streets are beginning to fill up again. Campuses are hotbeds of disorder. Crime is on the increase.

Let me tell you my personal experiences and that of my office in this regard, in just the past four years.

My house has been burglarized.

The apartment of my Legislative Assistant has been burglarized, within the shadow of the Supreme Court building.

Several hundred dollars worth of goods were stolen from one of my secretary's apartment. One secretary had her purse snatched and was pushed down before the thief ran away.

One of my patronage employees was robbed and assaulted on the public street within a few blocks of the capitol dome.

And, one secretary had her automobile stolen last September and then broken into just last month. In the first instance, the teenage thief was slightly slapped on the wrist and sent merrily on his way.

Last month when her car was broken into and a tire stolen, the guilty party was turned scott free even though he was caught with the goods from her car and several others.

It seemed the police officers had not properly advised him of his so-called constitutional rights in connection with the arrest.

And, to top it all off, after spending the better part of the day in court to watch the man turned loose, this secretary left the courtroom to find a \$2 parking ticket on her car.

And unfortunately, all too often in the forefront of all this lawlessness and disorder are our young people. This indicates to me that something is bad wrong and something very serious is lacking.

It doesn't take a psychiatrist to tell us what many of our young people need today: A lot of love . . . attention and affection . . . and a haircut. Someone told me the other day that it's gotten hard to tell the males from the females, unless they're skinny-dipping.

Well, I want to say this. I am proud of what I see in Georgia. Last week, I had occasion to address the Georgia Association of Student Councils at Rock Eagle. Here were about 800 fine young boys and girls, all leaders in their schools and all at least "B" students, I didn't see a one among them who needed a haircut. I didn't see a one who needed a shave. I didn't see a one who looked like he wanted to get out in the street and carry some kind of silly sign, or mouth Communist propaganda about our involvement in Viet Nam, or

start a revolt on his high school campus just to show that he was against authority, as so many young people are doing today.

I think these people were representative of Georgia youth, and I think this is why we haven't had this kind of trouble in Georgia.

I think most Georgia young people stand tall and walk straight, and they're too busy working and studying and trying to improve themselves and their state to get out in the street singing and chanting and marching off in all directions.

I am proud of what we have in Georgia, and I know you are, too.

By the same token, I am sickened by much of what we see in many of our large cities and schools across the country. I do not believe we ought to stifle dissent. I do not advocate infringing on anyone's right of free speech. But—

I do not believe that burning one's draft card . . . desecrating the American Flag . . . slandering the President of the United States . . . or spouting the Communist line falls within the realm of reasonable or sensible dissent. As a matter of fact, it is a disgrace to the United States and an insult to our fighting men in Viet Nam.

I say that it ought to be halted. And every public leader from the President on down ought to see that it is halted by making it crystal clear to these beatniks, vietniks and—in some cases—just plain criminal elements, that law and order is going to prevail in this country, come what may.

—And that we are going to keep our commitments in Viet Nam and prosecute this war to a successful conclusion.

—And that the Communists are making a big mistake if they pay any attention at all to these bleeding hearts who would have us tuck our tail and run.

I was brought up to believe that the one who wants to throw in the towel and quit is the loser. And that's just what these people are—Losers.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE DISCUSSION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed increase in postal rates has aroused considerable discussion. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had quite a deluge of mail. But among those comments I have some highlights—one is from the Washington Post as follows:

POSTAL REFORM—PART I

Why should an affluent, technologically progressive country be concerned about the imminent breakdown of its postal service? Men who can land an intact vehicle on the surface of the moon are surely capable of transporting objects over a small area of the earth's surface. But the goal of postal efficiency remains elusive, a disquieting reminder of the widening gap between the potentialities of technology and the social organization required for their realization.

The Post Office now handles about 80 billion pieces of mail a year. In the last 20 years the volume has almost doubled, and at the present rate of growth it will double again in only 14 years. Yet much of the mail is still being sorted and transported much as it was a century ago. An army of 700,000 is

required to move it, and one gloomy postal authority, taking note of the diminishing efficiency of operations, predicted that if present trends continue to the year 2000, every man, woman and ambulant child will be delivering mail.

But we need not become a nation of mail carriers. As a result of experiments conducted by the Post Office's Department of Research and Engineering since 1956, a great deal is known about how to increase efficiency. With optical scanners and a number of less sophisticated devices, the process of sorting and moving the mountains of paper can be mechanized. But the modernization of the system will require a large capital outlay, \$5 billion according to the estimate of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien. At the moment \$100 million is being spent on a crash mechanization program. Whether or not the Post Office continues to be operated as a Federal agency, or is transferred to a nonprofit corporation as Mr. O'Brien proposes, there is no way of escaping from the need for a massive infusion of capital.

Unfortunately, the problem of postal efficiency involves much more than capital equipment. Efficiency is hampered by the political appointment of postmasters. And for years the postal workers' unions have hampered the growth of productivity by using their political influence to legislate restrictive work rules. Public Law 89301, passed by the 89th Congress, provides that workers with seniority are to be given preference in the assignment of Monday-through-Friday schedules "to the greatest extent possible." As a consequence of the inflexibility in scheduling for a 7-day-a-week operation, postal authorities claim that they are compelled to hire 45,000 additional workers.

It should, however, be noted that the obstructionist tactics of the postal unions stem from bitterness and frustration. The hours are inconvenient; the work is dull; and the pay, despite recent increases, is poor. Some 85 per cent of all postal employees are in the four lowest grades, and the highest income to which they can aspire after 21 years of service is only \$7257. Limited opportunities for advancement breed resistance to the very technological changes that would create higher paying and more interesting jobs.

Mr. O'Brien is right in insisting that the managers of the postal system must have effective control over labor policies. But there must also be radical changes in the structure of postal rates, a subject that will be discussed in the concluding editorial.

POSTAL REFORM—PART II

When governments persist in selling services at far below costs, they create what John Stuart Mill described as "intractable problems." Suppose that Congress were to establish a flat, \$70 ceiling on domestic air flights in excess of 150 miles, irrespective of the distance traveled, but permitted increases in the rates for shorter flights. The nightmarish results are not difficult to envisage. Airlines would be deluged with business between such points as Honolulu and New York or Washington and Los Angeles. The excess demand would create a "shortage" of the larger jets, and the airlines would rightfully claim that the lack of profits made it impossible to purchase more equipment. And at the same time, short-distance flight fares would increase sharply with a probable deterioration in the quality of service.

Congress would not be so irrational as to impose such a ceiling on long-distance flights, but for more than 110 years it has committed similar errors in setting postal rates. By pricing some classes of postal services at far below cost, it creates excess demand which tax the capacity of the postal system. First-class air mail revenues exceeded the costs of delivery by 21 per cent in 1966. But the percentage of costs covered for second-class mail—magazines and newspapers—was a little more than

21 per cent, and for third-class mail—principally direct mail advertising—it was less than 63 per cent.

Why is the structure of postal rates so irrational? Prof. Jane Kennedy of Houston University, in a penetrating historical analysis, concludes that "postal rates are used to accomplish all sorts of social and political objectives extraneous to the delivery of mail." A desire to win favor with the press caused Congress to provide second-class subsidies in the Jacksonian era. (By withdrawing second-class mailing privileges, the Post Office can exercise dangerous powers of censorship.) In 1851, the Post Office discontinued its policy of abandoning unprofitable mail in order to assist rural communities through subsidized service. Third- and fourth-class mail rates were set with an eye to helping the mail-order industry.

In addition to the subsidies granted by virtue of class rates, there is a category of "public service" subsidies, paid for out of general funds at a cost of about \$600 million a year. In 1966, \$110 million of the "public service" subsidies represented the cost of special, low rates for "nonprofit publications," periodicals such as the *National Geographic*, the *Journal of the American Medical Society* and *Nation's Business*, none of which pay income taxes on large advertising revenues.

Rather than perpetuate this peculiar patchwork of subsidies and the resulting misallocation of postal resources, Congress should wipe the slate clean. There need be only two classes of mail, air and surface, and if possible all rates should reflect both weight and distance. The practice of charging a flat rate for first-class mail, irrespective of the distance carried, began in the early 19th century when the Post Office feared that it would lose its letter-carrying monopoly. Its perpetuation should hinge only on whether it would be inconvenient to establish zone rates.

In summing up, three reforms are required for an efficient postal service: the modernization of physical facilities; the elimination of restrictive labor practices; and the rationalization of the postal rate structure. Whether or not the system continues to be run by the Government, Congress and only Congress has the power to institute these reforms. These and a host of other issues should be studied by the Commission on Postal Organization, a group of distinguished citizens recently convened by President Johnson.

Another expression of opinion is from the Magazine Publishers Association over the signature of John K. Herbert, president:

DEMOLISHING THE MYTH THAT FIRST-CLASS MAIL PAYS ITS WAY

If I tell you that when first class mail pays 103% of its way and it is still not paying its proper share of postal rate costs, you will think me nuts. But that's the way it is. The postal rate situation is a very complex one and since your point of view is a communicative one and since you want it to be accurate, will you continue reading?

Postmaster General O'Brien, who should know his business, testified before the House Appropriations Sub-committee on postal matters that first class mail should pay 140% of its cost.

The reason for this seemingly extraordinary statement is the basic postal rate law which requires that first class mail should recover not only its fully allocated cost, but the extra amount representing the fair value of the preferential handling it receives. Postmaster General O'Brien says this is 140%.

The proposed increase on first class mail of 1¢ makes its contribution 123% of its allocated cost and, therefore, according to the leading authority, it still will not be paying its way. To meet the Postmaster General's standard, first class should be raised to 2¢.

Whether this is good judgment is a question for Congress.

But this is my point: if the fair return of first class by law and by the Postmaster's testimony is 140%, then it would take a 7¢ first class stamp to bring this about. Under these conditions, second and third class mail at 28¢ and 60¢ are more than paying their share.

The foregoing is an attempt to clarify your thinking. You may conclude that it is propaganda, but we are simply making a recitation of the facts. As Casey Stengel would say, "You can look it up."

ESSENTIAL POINTS ABOUT POSTAL RATES (H.R. 7977, 7978, AND IDENTICAL BILLS)

The Administration has proposed the largest postal rate increase in history—a bill to raise almost \$825 million a year when fully effective. Most of the money, \$536.5 million, would come from penny increases in first-class rates, raising postcards to 5 cents, letters to 6 cents, and airmail to 9 cents. The first-class letter rate increase would be 20 percent. Second-class mail would be increased 23 percent, bulk third class 32 percent, and fourth-class educational materials 21 percent. For the following reasons, the magazine industry believes the proposed increase on zone-rated publications is excessive.

ZIP Code Has Shifted Burden to Mailers.—Since January 1, 1967, magazines have been required to presort their mail by ZIP Code numbers. Well before the deadline, most magazines voluntarily complied with the ZIP requirement, at considerable expense. This expensive change has meant that publishers have assumed functions formerly carried out by postal employees.

One reason why second-class magazines are carried at a lower rate than first-class letters is shown below:

	Post office handlings required for—	
	A letter	A magazine
1. Collection from mailbox.....	X	
2. Transport to post office.....	X	
3. Stacking and postmarking.....	X	
4. Primary separation.....	X	
5. Secondary sort.....	X	
6. Tie in bundles.....	X	
7. Put in mailbag.....	X	
8. Dispatch to train.....	X	
9. Transportation.....	X	
10. Delivery to destination post office.....	X	Some. Do.
11. Primary sort.....	X	
12. Secondary sort.....	X	X.
13. Transport to post office station.....	X	X.
14. Sort by carrier route.....	X	X.
15. Delivery by carrier.....	X	X.

Whereas the average letter is handled 15 times by the Post Office, the average magazine is handled only 6 times under ZIP Code requirements. This reduction of handlings will substantially lessen Post Office costs while increasing publishers costs.

The Post Office has estimated that its savings on second- and third-class mail because of ZIP Code will be \$42 million. We believe this underestimates the potential savings. While Post Office costs have been reduced, publisher costs of ZIP compliance have been increased—an indirect but nonetheless expensive rate increase for magazines. Nor is this a one-time cost that has already been absorbed. There will be continuing annual costs of compliance with the new sorting and sacking requirements of ZIP Code. Many magazines estimate these additional costs to be in excess of the proposed increase for second-class postage. The Post Office Department is now engaged in a campaign to persuade the general public to use ZIP Code numbers on their mail. This pro-

gram has been wholeheartedly supported in the public interest by the magazine industry. Magazine publishers have contributed 1,087,000,000 page impressions of advertising space in magazines to further the campaign of the Post Office Department to persuade the public to use ZIP Code on first-class mail.

Costs and Rates.—Congress has repeatedly determined that first-class mail shall recover not only its fully allocated cost but an extra amount representing the fair value of the preferential handling and extra services it receives. That is the law today, and the pending bill would not change it. The reason a 6-cent letter is being requested now is that first-class cost coverage has declined to 103 percent. Historically, this is far too low. It has been as high as 164 percent, and for the twenty year period ended in 1964 the average was 142 percent. Even if a 6-cent letter rate is enacted, the coverage would be only 123 percent. In testimony this year before the House Subcommittee on Postal Appropriations, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien said first-class cost coverage should be 140 percent. To attain that figure would require a 7-cent letter rate, which would produce about \$1 billion in added annual revenue from first-class mail alone—more than enough to put the Post Office in the black without any second- or third-class increases. The following chart shows the historical pattern: [Chart not printed in RECORD.]

First-class mail is the priority service and properly pays the highest rate. Second- and third-class mail are deferred services, with charges properly reflecting the type of service rendered. The following chart, based on official Post Office figures, illustrates the post-war trend, showing that second- and third-class mailers have been burdened with a disproportionate share of the increase in general postal costs. First-class rate increases have lagged far behind those on second and third class, while first-class piece cost increases have climbed well above second and third class.

The following table tells the story:

Cost per piece and rates (1951-66)
[Percent of rise]

First class:	
Costs	100
Rates	67
Second class:	
Costs	61
Rates	122
Third class:	
Costs	89
Rates	188

A few final words on costs. Magazine publishers do not accept the Cost Ascertainment System as accurately reflecting second-class costs. We dispute the claim that magazines do not pay a sufficient share of their cost, and we deplore the use of these Cost Ascertainment figures, which the Post Office states are not intended for rate-making purposes, to allege underpayment by publishers. We believe that Congress should develop its own cost figures, as promised by the Senate Post Office Committee in 1962, before second-class rates are increased.

Productivity and Mechanization.—Postal productivity in mail sorting and handling operations has declined for each of the past two years and is expected to decline in the coming year. One reason is the lack of mechanization in the Post Office Department. While progress is being made, the Department is woefully behind private industry in modernizing its facilities. The Postmaster General has stated that he needs \$1 billion per year for each of the next five years to modernize the postal system. Providing the proper tools for increasing the productivity of its employees is basic to sound postal management.

Postal workers should be paid a proper wage, but if they are not provided with the

proper means of increasing productivity in handling the 80 billion pieces of mail now flooding the postal system, then the accelerating unit cost spiral will be even more damaging to postal finances. Wages have risen since 1961 by about 25 percent while overall productivity has risen only 4 percent. This relationship must be improved. Mechanization is only one of several means to achieve it, but it is most important.

Private industry has been able to keep rising costs in check by increasing the productivity of their workers through heavy investment in modern plant and equipment. The Post Office does not have the control over its own operations that a corporation exercises. Eighty percent of Post Office costs are for wages for over 700,000 employees—Congress sets the pay scales and determines how much the postal service can invest in labor-saving machinery.

The following table contrasts overall productivity and pay increases in the Post Office with the twenty-year record of private industry:

Productivity and pay increases, 1945-65
[In percent]

U.S. Post Office:	
Productivity	26
Pay	194
U.S. industry:	
Productivity	78
Pay	143

Public Services and Postal Policy.—Congress wisely determined in 1958 and again in 1962 that the Post Office engages in many necessary functions unrelated to delivery of the mail, and that the cost of providing such services should be paid from general revenues. Included in this category were 10 to 20 percent of the cost of operating rural services and small post offices in villages, the loss on non-profit publications and publications for the blind. Magazine publishers endorse the philosophy of prior postal policy legislation but believe the existing law does not go far enough. Examples of public service costs not now included in public services are forest fire observation and the apprehension of criminals by the Postal Inspection Service. Magazine publishers believe that the earmarking of \$594 million this year for public service costs is fully justified and that a careful study of all postal operating costs would enlarge the list of public services and increase the amount of the allocation. To do so would decrease the sum needed to be raised through rate increases.

Even with all its non-postal costs included in its budget, the Post Office Department occupies a unique role. It is the only Department which serves every American regardless of his location, station in life, or income. It is also the Department which comes closest to paying its way, recovering 80 percent of its costs. The Department of Commerce, by contrast, costs the taxpayers more money to operate than the Post Office and recovers only 2.7 percent of its expenses.

For the foregoing reasons, although magazine publishers spend millions of dollars on first-class mail, we do not oppose rate legislation this year and we support the proposed increase on first-class rates. However, the proposed increases in second-class rates on zone-rated publications are excessive.

And the final view is expressed in the New York Times by Robert B. Semple, Jr., as follows:

BATTLE LINES FORM FOR HOUSE HEARING ON
POSTAL RATE RISE PLAN
(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—Conflict is expected to break out in Congress next week among the users of the Nation's mails. The battlefield will be provided by the Subcommittee on Rates of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The subcommittee will begin hearings Tuesday on President Johnson's proposal to raise postal rates, but already the lines have formed. First class mailers are saying they are tired of "subsidizing" second and third class users who get cheaper rates.

Second and third class mailers have countered with a variety of arguments, including the charge that first class receives better service and should pay more. And the second class users, including newspapers and magazines, and the third class users, mainly direct mail advertisers, are also squabbling with one another.

The President's proposal would raise \$812-million more in revenue over the next three years and is designed to meet an estimated gap of \$650-million a year between postal revenue and postal expenses, a gap that does not include further losses incurred by "public services" performed by the post office at the direction of Congress.

JOHNSON'S PLAN OUTLINED

Under the President's plan, the price of first class and air mail stamps would rise 1 cent, effective July 1, to 6 and 9 cents respectively, increases of 21 per cent on second class rates for newspapers and magazines delivered outside their counties of publication and 32 per cent in minimum postage for bulk rate third class matter are the other major elements of the rate package.

Little serious opposition is expected to the proposed increases in first class mail rates—in part because first class users are not organized to lobby their case effectively with Congress. The real battle, which may keep the hearings going for more than a month, and perhaps beyond the July 1 effective date of the proposed increases in first class mail—will involve second and third class users and their friends and critics in Congress.

The departments agree that recurrent post office deficits are unhealthy, express sympathy for the generation of Postmasters General who have had to operate at a loss—the post office last broke even in fiscal year 1945, accumulating since then a deficit of more than \$12.5-billion—and insist they are willing to pay their "fair share" of the rates necessary to reduce those deficits.

But they do not want to pay what they believe is a disproportionate share of the costs of making up the deficit. They argue that already the ratios are out of line. For example, John K. Herbert, president of the Magazine Publishers Association, asserted recently:

"It is abundantly clear that a considerable portion of the historical share has been unreasonably shifted to the other classes of mail. As a result, the treatment of second and third class mail has, to say the least, verged on the punitive."

To understand these and similar arguments, it is necessary to examine the post office deficit, who contributes to it, and why.

In the fiscal year 1967, ending June 30, the department's net operating loss is estimated at \$1.2-billion, up from \$942-million in fiscal year 1966. This deficit, however, consists of two parts. One is the direct subsidy ordered by Congress as a "public service" under the Postal Policy Act of 1958 "to benefit the nation as a whole rather than any one mail user group."

These services, which account for \$567-million of the deficit, include free and reduced-rate mail for non-profit publications, fraternal magazines such as The American Legion Magazine, and publications defined as "educational," such as The National Geographic; nonpostal services such as selling Savings Bonds; special services such as money orders, and a small part of the costs of operating third and fourth class post offices, rural routes and so-called "star" routes, which are intercity routes operated by private carriers.

PREFERENTIAL RATES

The rest of the deficit, defined as a "hidden subsidy" by some and defended as indispensable by its beneficiaries, derives from not charging certain kinds of mail enough to cover the cost of handling that mail—in other words, from preferential rates.

The size of this deficit—known as the "postal deficiency"—is \$652-million.

The main recipient of preferred rates are second and third class users. By law, first class postage must cover full handling costs plus "an additional amount representing the preferential treatment it receives," including faster service.

First class now pays about 103 per cent of the costs of handling. Mr. Johnson's proposals would increase this to 123 per cent. Moreover, the increases on first class and air mail, which account for 55 per cent of all mail volume would yield about 68 per cent of the new revenues under the proposed legislation—\$536.5-million.

No other class of mail produces a surplus. Although the Postal Policy Act of 1958 requires Congress to adjust postal rates periodically to balance revenues with costs after "public service" expenses have been written off, there are no specific guidelines, which means that the field is wide open for controversy and Congressional disputes.

Second class mail, for example, will lose about \$416-million in fiscal year 1967. Of this, nearly half stems from public service costs—such as reduced rates for fraternal magazines—and about \$236-million stems from "regular" second class mail, mainly mass circulation magazines such as Time and Newsweek, newspapers and business publications. Thus, second class contributes about one-third of the \$652-million "postal deficiency."

The Administration contends that regular second class mail pays only 29.3 per cent of the costs of handling but proposes to raise the cost coverage to 36.2 percent. This would cost publishers an estimated \$25-million in new mailing costs and, in the words of Mr. Herbert, "will be a great hardship for many fine magazines that are struggling to keep their heads above the rising tides of costs."

The proposed increase on second class regular mail would account for about 3 per cent of the \$812 million that Mr. Johnson wants to raise over the next three years.

The total loss on third class mail, mostly direct mail advertising, is expected to be about \$401-million, of which \$100-million is attributed to public service costs—for example fund raising appeals and church meeting notices and \$301-million to regular mailing.

Third class regular mailing thus causes a little less than half of the \$652-million "postal deficiency."

Under the Administration's proposals, the cost coverage on advertising circulars (including those addressed simply to "occupant") would rise from 61.2 per cent to 80.2 per cent, costing mailers \$154.1-million and accounting for about 20 per cent of what Mr. Johnson would like to raise.

Most of the controversy will probably center on the proposed increases for third class mail, which also includes a \$34.9-million increase for single piece third class mail, mainly greeting cards, small parcels and catalogues.

FIFTY PERCENT RISE ASKED

A leading opponent of third class subsidies, Representative Ken Hechler, West Virginia Democrat, argues that "if billboards and newspaper advertisers pay their own way, why should these people expect the taxpayers to pick up their costs?"

He has introduced a bill that would raise the regular third class bulk rate 50 per cent instead of the 31 per cent proposed by the Administration.

The third class users counter with an economic

argument. The president of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, Harry J. McGinnis, asserts that sales through direct mail advertising amount to \$40-billion annually and account for 4 to 5 million jobs, thereby justifying the lower rates.

Proponents of second class subsidies argue that in addition to providing advertising space, newspapers and magazines also provide educational values that merit a continuing subsidy.

The two classes occasionally fight with each other. Newspapers and magazines regularly denounce third class advertising circulars as "junk mail" and an irritant to the "occupant" who receives them.

Mr. McGinnis says that newspapers and magazines are merely envious because they do not like "major department stores spending advertising dollars on direct mail catalogues and circulars."

I have no opinion to express on these publications until after all of the hearings are conducted, but I thought my colleagues would like to know what we are being subjected to.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON REAFFIRMS OUR COMMITMENT TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks at the White House last night, President Johnson put an end to irresponsible speculation that the administration has abandoned its commitment to the war on poverty.

The President made it clear that his administration is determined to continue this vital program—and at full throttle. The Doubting Thomases will just have to find another issue.

Those of us who know President Johnson know that he does not make a commitment lightly. We have learned better. If there is any doubt left on this score, I would only say remember Atlantic City in 1964. There, at the Democratic National Convention, our President committed his administration to a broad range of programs and policies.

To date, he has kept more than 90 percent of these promises.

And he will keep his word on the commitment to the war on poverty.

I commend the President for his wise leadership in this battle. And I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people are ready and willing to join with the administration in carrying forward the important work of the poverty program.

I urge my colleagues of the 90th Congress—on both sides of the aisle—to support the programs that, in the President's words, are offering needy Americans the chance to help themselves.

The promise of America is the opportunity it offers for Americans to realize their dreams and ambitions. We must insure that the boundaries of opportunity are extended to include all Americans who desire self-fulfillment.

This is the real meaning of the war on poverty. And this historic battle has only begun.

THE TEACHER CORPS: IT WORKS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk recently about abolishing one of the finest programs approved by this Congress in years, the Teacher Corps.

I could deliver a lengthy speech defending this program on its own merits—but such a speech would be unnecessary. The best defense of the Teacher Corps is its end result. And that result is told many times over by young American boys and girls whose horizons have been broadened by this remarkable and imaginative program.

In the April issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, Richard A. Graham, the distinguished Director of the Teacher Corps, presents some case histories that I commend to all of my colleagues. I particularly commend them to those who would do away with the Teacher Corps in the name of efficiency.

I insert this article in the Record:

THE TEACHER CORPS: IT WORKS

(By Richard A. Graham)

Can a nation enjoying unprecedented economic prosperity ignore some 5 million children in poverty and force them to accept second-rate education and its grim consequences just because they are poor?

President Johnson has answered "no" by calling up new troops to join in the battle against poverty of the mind. They are the Teacher Corps, a group of 1,200 apprentices and veteran teachers now serving in 111 school districts across the country.

Now the President has asked Congress to expand the Corps to five times its present size by 1968 to provide what he called a "symbol of hope" for poor children across the country.

Established in November 1965 as part of the Higher Education Act, the Teacher Corps is designed to train prospective teachers in the special methods needed to successfully teach the poverty child. The Corps, however, was not able to get fully into operation until it received all its funds in October 1966.

Today, thanks to its work in 29 states, the Teacher Corps is proving it can make good on its promise.

In mid-March, Life magazine said of the Corps: "At these prices, it remains the best bargain in the federal education program."

The Corps has gone where it was wanted and needed into the understaffed, overpopulated schools of America's urban ghettos and rural slums. It has done the job it was asked to do—helping overworked classroom teachers while it trained new teachers for the toughest job in education—teaching students who had no incentive to learn; who would rather have three square meals a day than a diploma.

How has the Teacher Corps accomplished these ends in six short months?

It cannot be judged either in dollars and cents or statistics—only in terms of children.

A success story in Solidad, California; another in Conway, Arkansas, added to reports

from Teacher Corps programs across the country, add up to this: it works.

One such story was reported recently by one of four participating colleges in New York City. A teacher-intern is working with a small group of 10-year-olds who had been written off as "social adjustment problems." They skipped class regularly and already had police records.

At the request of the principal, the corpsman set up a special program that takes these children from their regular classrooms for scheduled periods each week. It is paying off in two ways: the boys no longer dominate the class and overpower the teacher. And they are getting needed guidance and a teacher they can talk to man-to-man. The young corpsman didn't realize how well he had won these boys over until he got a call from one of the boys' older brothers—a high school dropout. The older boy just wanted to know if the corpsman had time to teach him and his pals how to read. The corpsman dug into his own pocket for rent on a storefront where he holds night classes for the dropouts.

The kids aren't the only ones who appreciate the corpsmen. Parents in Arkansas and an impoverished Appalachian area also have expressed their thanks to local corpsmen with daily gifts of precious home-grown fruits and vegetables.

Stories like these suggest that corpsmen have made the program work not only in the classrooms but in the school neighborhoods. Community acceptance is an important part of their work and training.

In Brooklyn, corpsmen have organized storefront centers which serve as social spots as well as training centers where women can learn typing and shorthand.

In Philadelphia, evening "arm chair" classes have been organized for illiterate adults. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, a community library was stocked by corpsmen who managed to get 1,000 paperback books donated by an understanding publisher. In southern Texas, corpsmen took mothers on their first tour of a big city supermarket.

There are other examples, but they all point up the fact that the teacher in the slums gets through to his students best if he is part of the scene—part of the child's daily life.

This way the corpsmen have learned how poverty limits a child's experiences and slows down the learning process. It is common in ghetto schools to find youngsters two years behind the average by the time they reach third grade, hopelessly behind by the time they should be ready for high school.

Although unequal educational opportunities are so often defined in terms of a racially imbalanced school, corpsmen have learned that it means much, much more.

In a slum school, 35 youngsters of varying background and abilities are often grouped together and expected to perform at the same speed and grade level. It just doesn't work but, in an overcrowded schoolroom manned by an overburdened teacher, this is the only way the school can keep its doors open.

How does the corpsman help? On the one hand, by taking the child who learns slowly and giving him personal, patient attention. On the other, by working with gifted students, giving them the extra push and confidence which will get them through high school, perhaps into college.

In one junior high school in Washington, D.C., for example, a young corpsman is now giving daily literature lessons to four exceptional students who have been coasting along in their regular English class. The course is held during half of the children's lunch period and runs 30 minutes. Books must be read at home and the children must be prepared to discuss them, in depth. The questions posed by the corpsman are tough and provocative—they are making these children

think as they have never had to think before. The group is currently reading *The Taming of the Shrew* and short stories by Salinger—heavy going even for the average college freshman.

"We've got to tax these kids," says one intern from Arkansas. "It doesn't matter if they are bright or below average—whatever their abilities, you have got to push them. You have to make them want to overreach. They enjoy it. Failure is a built-in commodity in the slums. It's expected, accepted. Success, however, is understood and means something very special to these kids. And they recognize it and love it."

How to give these children the extra push varies from Teacher Corps project to project. Since local school administrators determine how and where corpsmen can best be used, each corps member's assignment and academic preparation differs. Their work is specifically geared to the needs of the local schools they are serving. In fact, the local school administrators work closely with the corpsmen's training institutions to develop the two-year graduate work-study program.

In Chicago, public schools work with a group of colleges and universities to develop the Teacher Corps program. Corps activities here center on developing the urban child's language skills.

In Canada, Kentucky, the focus is different. This remote, rural area requires the corpsmen to introduce the children to life beyond the hills, to teach them about newspapers, telephones, escalators and restaurants, things almost taken for granted by the urban poverty child.

In Rio Grande City, Texas, teaching English as a second language is the corpsmen's priority. Here, 95 percent of the children are Spanish-speaking and start school not knowing a word of English.

Although the Teacher Corps has proved itself, its future may be uncertain. The Corps will require renewed congressional authorization and appropriations.

The Teacher Corps has support in the top areas of government. It has support at the bottom in the children the Corps is helping, the college faculties who are learning much about training teachers from the Corps and in the teachers who welcome the help.

It needs more support in the middle. It needs the support of all those who believe every boy and girl has a right to a good education, no matter how poor their homes.

GUNNAR MYRDAL SPEAKS TO ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the 20th annual convention of the Americans for Democratic Action held in Washington in April 1967, we were honored with a visit from the distinguished Swedish economist, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal. Dr. Myrdal's remarks before the convention were too penetrating to not receive broader publications and so, under unanimous consent I include the following address by Gunnar Myrdal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Myrdal, since his monumental work on "The American Dilemma," has been renowned as a sort of international citizen—a critic of our society who nevertheless shares our deep commitment to

the ideals and traditions of America. He sees a threat to the maintenance of these ideals in the tremendous impact at home and abroad of the war in Vietnam and the awesome role this Nation has assumed as the world's policeman, a role which is influenced by a rigid, fearful, and often neurotic view of nationalist and revolutionary movements.

We must pay particular heed to some dire predictions made by Dr. Myrdal. He asks that we think the unthinkable. He asks that we examine the ever-tightening stricture of population pressure and food production and the ever-widening income gap between rich nations and poor. We must face the ominous meaning of this for the underdeveloped nations and the whole world and be prepared to take the requisite steps to avoid full-scale chaos. Dr. Myrdal's excellent and unprovocative remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GUNNAR MYRDAL, ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

No personal recognition has pleased me more than my election to become an extra-regular "American for Democratic Action." I have never been a non-partisan in American public affairs. I have been a New Dealer, a Fair Dealer, a New Frontiersman, and, of course, a private in the Unconditional War Against Poverty and for the ultimate attainment of the Great Society. And I have rather been on the side of the activists—as has the ADA—urging better planning of the reforms and speedier action.

In my own view, this has not interfered with my search for objective truth as an economist and social scientist. This is related to my conviction that research needs the stating of explicit value premises—already when establishing facts and factual relationships and not only when drawing political conclusions. "Things look different, depending upon where you stand."

This is, however, not an appropriate occasion to discuss the methodology of social study. But, on a personal note still, and simply to "define the situation" of my speaking at this banquet, I would like to mention that, in studying American problems and, indeed, problems in other parts of the world as well, my value premises have consistently been what I have called the "American Creed." By this I mean the glorious ideals of liberty, equality and justice, which this country inherited from European Enlightenment and has stubbornly adhered to ever since—in principle.

The ideals are far from realized. There have been periods of grim reaction, and there have at all times been individuals and whole communities trampling on these ideals—and other individuals and communities opportunistically yielding to the social and political forces around them rather than standing up in their defense. Nevertheless, as I read the history of this country, the trend in America has been towards a gradually fuller realization of these ideals. That is also the deeper justification for their use as relevant and significant value premises in social study.

Contrary to many of my academic colleagues, I always stress that ideals are important social facts when they have a hold on people's minds and become rooted in institutions: in America the Constitution and many others. It is a fact that your national heroes on whom spiritual immortality has been bestowed, have almost all been convinced liberals, struggling for these ideals. I do believe that the same will be true in the future.

I have permitted myself these introductory remarks, because this organization—which is not a party, nor part of a party, but a fellowship bent upon influencing the people,

the parties, and the government—so definitely and actively stands in this long tradition of upholding and propagating the ideals I referred to as the American Creed. The ADA seeks to disturb complacency among the American people and politicians by persistently spelling out in concrete terms the radical changes of conditions and policies needed to realize these ideals. And it has not been unsuccessful as a long string of reforms, not least in recent years, testify. Some of these reforms are so radical that nobody would have believed them possible only a short time before they were enacted.

Back in Stockholm when I began to think about what I should say tonight, I read the *Program for Americans '66* and did so with increasing enthusiasm. It is clear and unambiguous; it is not evasive but faces squarely the burning problems of America and the world today. I believe I have never felt so much in agreement with any political program I have ever encountered anywhere in the world, including my native country, Sweden. These are the beacons I would follow—almost to the last detail—if I were an American Congressman or otherwise responsible for policy decisions in the United States.

The most sinister threat to all of our ideals, abroad and at home, is the Vietnam war. It has a horrifying impact on millions of people in a distant and very poor country who are starved, burned, maimed and killed, and who see their little property destroyed. And it has corroded the moral climate of this country. It threatens to frustrate all efforts of realizing the American ideals by reforms at home. There is no question that the civil rights battle, the rebuilding of the cities and the bulk of social legislation, have all come to a grinding halt.

This is stated here by a man who for decades has consistently been an optimist in regard to America. I have never, up until now, agreed with those who from time to time have prophesied that "it can happen here."

The Vietnam war is also causing a tightening moral and political isolation of this country in the world at large. It is the common people abroad who have become estranged from America, while some governments, officials and representatives of big-business almost everywhere may have their own good reasons for silently accepting or even for speaking with "understanding" of the policy of the United States government.

You might not be fully aware of this deeply tragic element in the foreign reaction to the United States' military activity in Vietnam and more broadly to the inclination of its present government to want to police the world on its own terms. In earlier times it was the farmers and workers in Europe who had on the whole, the friendliest feelings toward America. In their homes there were photographs of their near relatives who had emigrated, and there was a continuous exchange of letters. It was these people, along with most of the liberals and intellectuals who felt closest to America, while the traditional upper classes often felt cultural distance. It is now, however, the common people and even, more conspicuously the entire youth—who increasingly view the United States as a nation which is careless, insensitive and irresponsible in the exercise of its might and power. This is, as I said, deeply tragic.

I will not touch further on the Vietnam issue on this occasion, in spite of its paramount importance for everything dear to us. I must stress, however, that playing with fire in Southeast Asia becomes the more charged with danger because of several other threatening international developments. I will, as I now move on to characterize these developments, hopefully assume that the Vietnam war will soon end—and end in such a way that its people will be left free to seek their own destiny without any colonial "containment" policy upheld by American mili-

tary might. I hope for that, and we must begin to think of new perspectives.

Even under this optimistic assumption, our world does not present the picture of a sane, safe and wholesome home for humanity. The nuclear armament race continues unabated. The test ban is still only partial, leaving the atomic powers free to continue with underground tests. There is, as yet, no limitation to their production of still more forceful nuclear weapons and penetrating delivery systems. The nonproliferation issue, about which the newspapers are full, does not even touch these real disarmament problems.

While following the frustrated negotiations in Geneva from a distance, one impression retained is the following: in many countries, and particularly in the United States, those in the government who are sincerely interested in reaching a positive result are looking over their shoulders. They are quite free to express general, moving but noncommittal declarations about the horrifying dangers involved in the present armament race and of their eagerness to put a stop to it. But when it comes to agreeing on even a small practical step in that direction, they are acutely aware that at home they meet nationalist suspicions that they are letting down the guards and selling out the security of the country. The powerful military-industrial complex—to use former President Eisenhower's expression—has a vested interest in fostering such suspicions. This is probably also true in the Soviet Union. They also have their generals and suspicious nationalists and their military-industrial complex.

Considering the way people are informed—or rather misinformed—an organized propaganda campaign by a determined nationalist group can foment a wave of popular emotion. Cowardice towards the China lobby played a disastrous role in the United States policy toward China from 1949 onwards, when manipulating more or less dependent governments to block China's taking its place in the United Nations, and of, course, in the initial setting up and use of the Diem regime in South Vietnam as a bastion in the cold war, and the later successive escalations of the United States involvement in that war.

In the nuclear disarmament issue, the understandable anxiety to avoid arousing nationalist complexes back home has, first, severely constricted the room for reasonable negotiations. Secondly, it has given the government and its negotiators an interest in managing its releases, press conferences, and briefings in certain ways. Thus, facts and compromise proposals that do not fit the tactical positions taken by the United States government under the restraints caused by consideration of the volatile home front, tend to be overlooked or blotted out. This is the behavior of your negotiators, and your newspaper people collaborate.

In the final analysis, progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, in so far as it depends on the United States position, must rest on popular education, on people becoming better informed and thereby "propaganda-safe" not least towards your own officials (an expression from pre-war time that has unfortunately fallen out of use). This, in turn, would allow the government to follow a more courageous and rational line. I am aware that ADA plays a role in this field also, and I earnestly hope its educational activities will be intensified.

The widespread preparation for biological and chemical warfare is less on people's minds—except that the use of the Vietnam war by the American military for large scale experimentation with non-conventional weapons has greatly contributed to the moral and political isolation of the United States that I spoke of.

The United States, which has an obvious

and generally recognized interest in preventing proliferation of mass-destructive weaponry, should have had all reasons to refrain from these experiments, as they are breaking down inhibitions. These types of non-conventional weapons are cheap and do not require much large scale research. The risk is, indeed, that they might become the poor man's opportunity to commit genocide.

It is, of course, of paramount importance and urgency to reach intergovernmental agreements to outlaw biological and chemical warfare. The United States, as you know, has not even signed the Geneva Agreement of 1925. In this question I also see a field where one would wish the ADA to intensify activity.

There are other trends in the world at large that are pregnant with stupendous dangers. One major set of such trends are the developments among that great majority of mankind who lives in the underdeveloped countries. We are all aware that the income gap between them and us is increasing every year. The 1960's, which on the proposal of the late President Kennedy was named the "development decade," has seen instead a widespread failure to maintain even the slow progress of the 1950's.

The inflow of capital from the rich countries has tended to stagnate and as a percentage of their national output it has decreased by a quarter. At the same time, because more and more of it is tied to exports from the donor countries, the "quality" of aid has fallen. Also the political motives for directing the bilateral aid—which is by far the larger part of all "aid"—to particular countries, and the strings attached, are also apt to decrease its "quality."

At the same time a much smaller share of the capital flow is now in the form of credits instead of grants. Even if there has been a tendency, until recently, to keep interest rates low and amortization periods long, the net result has nevertheless been a rapid increase of the burden of debt-service to be paid out of the poor countries' meager export returns. The president of the World Bank and many others, who are competent to judge, have given us ringing warnings of the dire consequences of a failure to reverse these trends. But as yet there have been no signs of such a change.

Meanwhile, the population explosion in the poor countries is increasingly blighting their hopes for rapid advancement. It has been in actual fact by far the only really important economic and social change in the underdeveloped world.

Belatedly, the United States has in recent years been revising its position to a positive one in regard to the spread of birth control in the underdeveloped countries. And there are signs that both the Catholic Church and the communist countries are doing the same, thus releasing the World Health Organization and the other intergovernmental agencies from the political restraints that up until now have prevented them from assisting poor countries in family planning. More directly important is that we may now stand before a veritable technological breakthrough making new contraceptives available that can make a birth control campaign in underdeveloped countries truly effective.

But still there is need for decisive government action in the underdeveloped countries to embark upon a birth control campaign. There will be need for large cadres of doctors, nurses, and other para-medical personnel, and the rich countries can, at most, be helpful in training additional personnel, but cannot normally substitute for them. The new policy, even when it becomes accepted, raises huge administrative problems which are difficult to solve in countries that are what I call "soft states." It is an illusion to believe that in the underdeveloped world at large

progress in spreading birth control among the masses will be a swift one.

As these nations, because of the high fertility level up until now, have very youthful populations—with around 45 per cent under 15 years of age, against around 25 per cent in the developed countries—there is an extraordinary momentum in their population increase. The future parents are already born or will soon be born. By the same token, the labor force will, under all circumstances, continue to grow rapidly until the end of the century. This raises very large problems for economic planning, particularly in agriculture. To this I will return.

These last observations are most definitely not arguments against these countries trying to press down their birth rates as much and as rapidly as possible. Quite the contrary: they make this imperative all the more urgent. But we should guard ourselves from the illusion that it is easy and that impressive results on a world scale will be quickly achieved.

We know that in recent years food production in Latin America, Africa and Asia has tended to lag behind population expansion, thereby aggravating the already widespread undernutrition and malnutrition in almost all underdeveloped countries. There would have been intensified mass hunger in very big countries like India and Pakistan and in many smaller countries, had it not been for the availability of large scale food imports from the United States, granted without foreign exchange compensation under P.L. 480 from the surpluses in this country. These surpluses have now virtually disappeared.

Production restrictions have been eased in the United States. If they are lifted still more, food production can be raised considerably. There are also other countries that could produce more. But even on the optimistic assumption that we shall be able to make more food available—and agree on a formula for sharing the financial burden among the rich countries—food aid can at most bridge over an emergency. The real answer, if disaster is to be averted, is to generate a marked and sustained increase in agricultural productivity in the under developed countries themselves.

This assumes the application of a new agricultural technology. For the most part, it cannot be borrowed from the rich countries with temperate climates. Very much more of programmed, practically directed, specialized, and localized research into food production in areas in the tropical and subtropical zones will be needed. To accomplish this, these countries have neither the financial, nor the personnel resources, but will need large scale assistance from the rich countries.

Moreover, while the dramatic rise in yields in the rich Western countries could happen, while the labor force in agriculture was rapidly decreasing, the new technology in underdeveloped countries must be increasingly labor intensive, to a degree most agricultural experts do not fully appreciate. The present labor force is largely underutilized—what is popularly known as underemployment—and for decades to come it will continue to grow almost as fast as the total population increases at present, that is between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent a year. The practical problem is to raise crop yields by a larger input and a higher efficiency of a labor force that is now underutilized and is rapidly increasing all the time. This new, extremely labor-intensive technology is yet to be developed, mostly by fresh research focused on the specific preconditions in regard to factor proportions and, as I said, on the different climates and soils.

Then comes the practical problem of how to substitute the new techniques for the primitive ones that are responsible for the low yields. This raises a host of problems—

education and extension work, marketing, credits, and cooperation—but at the heart of them lies the terms on which the cultivator works the land. These terms, while different in different areas, are generally such that they do not give the toiler either practical possibilities or rational motivation for exerting himself to raise the yield.

This is the problem of land reform. In almost all underdeveloped countries vested interests have prevented effective land reform. The problem is a most complicated one and takes different forms in different countries. My point in this rapid survey over the world problems is merely that radical changes in the relation between man and land are necessary to raise agricultural yields which, in turn, is the only long run answer to world hunger.

The dimension of the problem is so overwhelmingly big, that food aid from America and the rich countries generally cannot do more than buy time for a vigorous and sustained food production drive in the underdeveloped countries. In the long run much can happen. At the end of the century we shall no doubt see entirely new techniques of producing food. It is the next fifteen to twenty years which worry me deeply.

I have been speaking in sweeping generalities. Unfortunately, they do, I believe, convey only too well the somber truth. I fear we are growing accustomed to living on happily and attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkable ahead of us.

More specifically, in regard to the development problems of the underdeveloped countries, I feel that we have been living, and are still living, in a fool's paradise. We have formed opinions which are heavily biased in an optimistic direction. The careless application of Western economic theories and models that are not adequate to reality in underdeveloped countries, has contributed to this, by making it possible to disregard levels and modes of living, and attitudes and institutions—that is, the social facts which raise obstacles and inhibitions to development.

The widespread habit of referring to the underdeveloped countries as "developing countries" is, of course, unimportant by itself, but it indicates the direction of the biases in our whole view of these problems. The biases are opportunistic. For if we could disregard the awkward facts just referred to and if we could believe that the underdeveloped world was surely "developing," this would make things a lot easier for us all. As the biases are also apt to encourage and please the governing elites in the underdeveloped countries, we cannot expect them to correct our attitudes. They share them with us.

In time, our scientific approaches will be corrected. Facts kick, as I used to say. As the research work proceeds, we shall in ten or fifteen years' time evolve quite different theories and models. Generally, I believe this development of the scientific orientation will go towards a more institutional approach, discarding the Western models we have used, and laying stress on the factors I mentioned which are now usually disregarded in the economic analysis of underdeveloped countries: modes and levels of living, attitudes, and institutions.

President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the Alliance for Progress with the Latin American countries provides an extreme example of the working of the optimistic biases. The exalted rhetoric of the message is not only empty, but grossly misleading as to facts and factual relationships. The most disquieting trait of the message is, however, that the urgent need for land reform and reform of the structure of taxation, which the late President Kennedy had emphasized when inaugurating the Alliance for Progress, has now been dropped. We can

be sure that this will please dominant interests in the Latin American countries as well as certain special interests in the United States.

I referred to the President's message because it highlights a common type of superficiality and bias in our view of the underdeveloped countries. The first condition for wisely directing our policies toward that huge majority of mankind that live in the underdeveloped countries is to have a correct appreciation of their realities.

We must squarely face what is happening to them: (1) the slackening rate of development in most of these countries; (2) the leveling off of the flow of financial resources from the rich to the poor countries; (3) in particular, the speedy rise of the debt service burden they have to meet; (4) the rapid rate of population increase, which, even on the most hopeful assumption regarding the spread of birth control, will continue to rise for some time ahead; (5) the sluggish improvement of agricultural productivity; and, hence, (6) the spectre of a world hunger crisis. These interrelated and speedily moving trends are, as I said, threatening. The dangers the world is facing are not placed as mere possibilities in a distant future, but are immediate and certain, if radical action is not taken by us in the rich countries and by those in the poor countries. The world will not be the same place ten or twenty years hence: either hell will have broken out, or we shall all have learned how to cooperate much more intensively and on a world scale.

Our "aid"—and to simplify matters I will include the whole net-inflow of capital and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries—has so far not been anywhere nearly large enough to make more than a dent in world poverty. In none of the rich countries have we made real sacrifices; in none has the aid been raised to the level of a really important item in our national budgets. Including in this connection the Soviet Union and its European allies, we are probably spending as much on war and war preparation as the total of national incomes in all underdeveloped countries put together (I then exclude China but take account of what the economists call opportunity costs, that is, the loss of income by the men who are drafted, and the national sacrifices inherent in employing so large a part of our scientific and engineering skills in unproductive activity). Most countries, including the United States, take protection—such as tying aid to exports—in order to make aid as cheap as possible, while lowering its value for the recipient countries.

A main reason for our niggardliness has, of course, been the opportunistic biases I have already mentioned. Future events will treat them roughly. The hunger crisis, when it aggravates, will be a real eye-opener to us all.

Another reason is that internal economic policies and external financial cooperation of rich countries themselves have been so weak and deficient as to have landed them all in the preposterous situation of having to nurse their balance of payments and take a restrictive view of all financial outflows, including those to the underdeveloped countries. The preservation of internal and external balance in the economic development of rich countries does not, in my opinion, constitute insoluble technical problems. This is an area where policies are dangerously lagging behind our available knowledge.

The same lack of competence, courage, and will to cooperate which brings rich countries into a position where they feel that they cannot afford larger outflows is also evidenced in their reluctance to provide the poor countries with greater market opportunities for their exports. In all of the rich countries there are special interests exerting pressures to prevent a more generous commercial policy towards the underdeveloped countries.

In this connection, I will restrict myself to the observation that the United States has not been among those rich countries who have shown much of a positive interest in meeting the demands of the underdeveloped countries. It has been less liberal than several other rich countries, both in the positions taken in UNCTAD and in its bilateral policies.

From what I have said, it is clear that reforming economic policies at home which are strongly in the interest of the rich countries themselves—attaining and preserving internal and external economic balance and resisting the pressure of special vested interest groups—would also make possible more generous policies towards the underdeveloped countries.

I would also like to stress that it is a world-wide interest that as much as possible of aid resources should be channeled through intergovernmental agencies, in particular those within the United Nations system. At present, multilateral aid forms only a small percentage of total aid. The explanation, of course, is that the big countries, and some small countries too, want to use aid in the political game. I feel sure that an internationalization of aid would greatly improve its effectiveness and also contribute to a more healthy international climate.

I believe that a gradual development in this direction will come naturally, if and when aid takes greater proportions. When the threatening hunger crisis makes it imperative that, to over-bridge an emergency, the rich countries come forward with bigger deliveries, and when much of these must come from the United States—which as a legacy from its agricultural policy since the 1930's has the possibility to increase its production very substantially by enlarging the sown areas—it is only natural that this country will feel that it should not pay for all of it. But other countries are not willing to pay to the U.S. Treasury for an American operation. They will demand that this aid be internationalized as a condition for their participation.

But much more important than anything the rich countries can do by way of aid and trade is what the underdeveloped countries must do themselves in order to make development possible. These countries need radical internal changes.

They need an effectively administered birth control campaign that reaches the poverty stricken masses. They need many more and much better schools, breaking the class monopoly over education and imparting skills and attitudes that are conducive to development and not, as often now, inimical to it. They need a vigorous movement for adult education of which in most poor countries there has been astonishingly little.

As I have already mentioned, most of them need land reform urgently. Generally, they need to tear down an entrenched social stratification that is preserving privileges for the few and withholding opportunities for the masses. They need to stamp out corruption which in most underdeveloped countries has been on the increase. They are all "soft states" and need very much more of internal discipline.

In many of these countries, for example India, it has for decades been almost a commonplace that a social and economic revolution is a necessary prelude to development. But of such revolution we have seen very little. To press for it and carry it out is a task for these people themselves.

But we can, at least, abstain from supporting reaction. Too often in a post-war era we have fallen into the tradition of colonial regimes of allying ourselves with the privileged classes, intent upon preserving social *status quo*. We have even pampered reactionary regimes using military assistance and bribes. And this—together with the careless use of poor countries as pawns in the Great

Power rivalry—is what gives credibility to the accusation that what we are offering the poor countries is but a new form of colonialism and imperialism.

In the re-orientation of the rich countries' policies toward the underdeveloped world, the United States should play its role, and it must be a considerably altered role. I believe, however, that it would be healthy if we stopped talking so much about American world leadership. Real leadership will come to the United States to the extent it does the right things, shows restraint in its use of power and wins the confidence of common people in the world.

It is no news that the United States has overkill capacity to exterminate mankind. It can certainly put fear into the whole world. But this is the opposite of world leadership. In fact, the U.S. government has managed to approach a low point of world confidence and true world leadership. America has abandoned *isolationism* but it has gone to the opposite extreme. Intent on policing the world on its own terms, it has instead invoked *isolation*.

A quarter of a century ago, when I brooded over things to come, I saw the danger of the United States falling for the illusion that financial and military might can substitute for the moral power of winning the sincere approval of all decent people in the world, not the opportunistic acquiescence of some dependent governments and business interests.

A most unfortunate casualty of the adventurous foreign policy of the United States government is, as I said earlier, that the reforms of its own society are being stifled. Wars breed reaction in many ways, monopolize the interest of public opinion, distort the economy, and breed a feeling that the margins for costly internal reforms have been narrowed.

In a queer and not altogether logical way the climate of warfare at the same time stimulates exaggerated ideas about the richness of the country. As this point it is my duty to put in a reminder that the American mansion is a heavily mortgaged piece of real estate. It has to invest trillions of dollars within the near future to rebuild completely its cities and, equally important, to rehabilitate the human content of the slums. As we all must be aware, this is an urgent necessity. The situation is continually deteriorating. Not to embark upon these huge investments soon, entails dangers for the cohesion of the American society and the stability of democracy.

Plans have to be worked out. They will need to embrace fundamental changes not only in housing policy but in transport and the division of the country in fiscal and administrative units. The Social Security legislation has to be remade so as to progressively integrate the under-employed, low productivity groups now in the slums. The structure of taxation that is now regressive up to a rather high level has to be reformed. And within the framework of all these reforms, new clean healthy modern cities will have to rise, where people can live and be happy and productive. They will have ample parks and recreation grounds, good public schools and hospitals.

And to enjoy this new life the inhabitants will have to be themselves educated out of their present slum-mindedness. Under any conditions this will take at least a generation to accomplish.

I am convinced that in the end these investments will be productive. The slums and the tolerance of a less well organized society is a drag even on American economic progress. But the investments are long-term ones and will for a time require the utmost economy of effort and entail sacrifices for the majority of Americans who are now in comfortable circumstances. The programs undertaken as part of the Unconditional War

Against Poverty are pointing in the right direction and may have their greatest importance by preparing the American people for the much bigger, better planned and better organized and administered investments in its future.

As I said, I am and I have always been an optimist about America. When the Vietnam war is ended—as I have optimistically assumed it will—the American people will have drawn certain lessons for the future course of United States foreign policy, I hope. And in regard to internal policies this proud nation that is so intensely and indeed exagerratedly aware of its wealth, will not for long be satisfied to remain the one country among the rich nations that has the most horrible slums, the dirtiest subways, the highest rate of unemployment, and of functional illiteracy, crime, and a sociality, and does least for the children of the poor, who are so many.

I would only add that changing these unfortunate conditions will give America a new image in the world. It will greatly increase its possibility to exert true leadership in a world which is sick and tired of force and violence but receptive to advice coming from a nation sincerely devoted to improve itself.

The history of American civilization has a strong legacy of puritan religiosity. Though undoubtedly it has contributed to the unfortunate self-righteousness which alienates America from enlightened opinion abroad, a more important effect is to make America more prepared than any other nation I know for conversion—for fundamental changes of approach and attitude. It is this dynamic capacity I rely upon when in spite of all I have to say, I look forward to an America that at home and abroad stands for what is really good for herself and for the world.

THE 10TH OF MAY: INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR RUMANIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated on this date.

The first event was in 1866, when Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern, a scion of the southern and Catholic branch of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed in Bucharest, Prince of Rumania, and thus was founded the first Rumanian dynasty. This occasion was made possible by the unrelenting efforts of Rumanian patriots, and the diplomacy of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French Empire. The establishment of this dynasty also brought to an end the strife and rivalry, which had long prevailed in the internal situation in Rumania.

The second noteworthy event occurred 11 years later in 1877 during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish war. Rumania proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a significant part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Berlin conference of 1878, confirmed Rumania's independence, a bright page in the country's dreary history, though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Russia from its

ally who helped them obtain victory over the Turks.

Four years later came the last of the three events to make history. In 1881, Charles I was crowned by the will of his own people, the King of Rumania. A prosperous era of six decades followed. Its apex was attained when national unity in the historic boundaries was reached after World War I. This socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all these years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished the 10th of May as their national holiday. The anniversary of happy and glorious events in their history, in which achievements of monarchy and people are interwoven. It remains the symbol of their permanency and perseverance, through woes and hardships, to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

As we commemorate the independence of Rumania, it might be well to reflect what independence means to us. We are guaranteed freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of choice and place to work, and an equitable share in the fruits of our labor. We may openly profess our belief in God, and the dignity of the individual. We salute the achievements of the Rumanians and may they someday in their own country live to enjoy the fruits of freedom and independence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLEPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 17, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. GALIFIANAKIS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) to revise and extend their remarks and to include tables and other pertinent extraneous matter:

Mr. QUILLLEN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, on May 10, 1967.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 10 minutes today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH to revise and extend and include extraneous matter in his remarks made during consideration of H.R. 9240.

Mr. STRATTON to revise and extend his remarks made during consideration of

H.R. 9240 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio to revise and extend his remarks made during considerations of H.R. 9240 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD during debate on H.R. 9240 and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland.

Mr. ERLNBORN.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. FRASER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 270. An act to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

736. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a letter requesting the appropriation of necessary funds to create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the United States foreign service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

737. A letter from the Acting Director Civil Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD-CONG (Q)2), for the quarter ending March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

738. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a letter recommending the combining of the functions of the Center for Educational

Cooperation, which is to be established in the office of the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, the functions of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, and the genuine educational and cultural aspects of the United States Information Agency, such as its libraries and English language teaching programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

No. 739. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination into the transfer of handtool and paint stocks from the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

740. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 232. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2531. A bill to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek Judgment Fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of interstate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs; with amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7965. A bill to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 9761. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9762. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9763. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of advertising revenues derived by a tax-exempt organization from its publication of a trade journal or other periodical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 9764. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9765. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9766. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 9767. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9769. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 9770. A bill to incorporate the Armed Forces Retired Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9771. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9772. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9774. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 9775. A bill to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 9776. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers on a merit basis under the civil service system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 9777. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit-sharing plans as those presently provided for employees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9779. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on irradiated fresh, chilled, or frozen fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 9780. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes" to require the preservation of Jackson Hill-Holt-Adams House and grounds in the

Nation's Capital; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9781. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 9782. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9783. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9785. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 9787. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the repair and modification of certain structures along the Illinois and Mississippi Canal in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9788. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9789. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 9790. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 with respect to the types of vessels which may be traded in for certain war-built vessels owned by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 9791. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9792. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9793. A bill to amend section 12 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 462), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9794. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Illinois Sesquicentennial to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 9795. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel to the Los Angeles Unified School District for nontransportation use in the training of merchant marine personnel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9796. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in exist-

ence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9798. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9800. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H.R. 9801. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 9802. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers and single persons who have attained age 30 and maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 9805. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9806. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9807. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9808. A bill to authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of St. Sebastian in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9809. A bill to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes to nursing homes in States which have in effect programs which provide for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meet certain requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9810. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipient; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9811. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9812. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the classification of the position of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, and Mr. ASPINALL):

H.R. 9813. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 9814. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grains programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9815. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, on such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9817. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9818. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9819. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9820. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 341. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the adoption of minimum wage and overtime compensation standards in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Res. 468. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Res. 469. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

187. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to informing residents of the county or counties where works of improvement are to be performed that construction contracts are being let; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

188. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the curtailment of agricultural imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to condemnation of the burning of the U.S. flag, or its desecration in any way; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

190. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9821. A bill for the relief of Raul A. Du-Breuil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9822. A bill for the relief of Ladislav G. Kerenyi, Claire Kerenyi, and Ladislav G. Kerenyi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 9823. A bill for the relief of Michael Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9824. A bill for the relief of Faye S. Tushan, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9825. A bill for the relief of Milanio Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 9826. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9827. A bill for the relief of Ligaya L. Villazor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9828. A bill for the relief of Cristina Rubio Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 9829. A bill for the relief of American Petrofina Co., of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9830. A bill for the relief of Chin Duck Sam also known as Yee Gim Ball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9831. A bill for the relief of Robert Harry Urch; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9832. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Mrs. H. G. Littrell, 5815 Lindo Pasco, San Diego, Calif., and the Mother's Crusade of San Diego County, Calif., relative to protesting aid and trade with Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Edward Smith, Represa, Calif., relative to a writ of habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. Also, petition of American Bakery & Confectionery Workers' International Union, AFL-CIO, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the improvement and modernization of the Federal social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Jacob Weitzman, Congregation B'nai Jacob, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Oveenu shbashomayim. Our Heavenly Father, may Thy divine presence rest upon us and upon all those who deliberate upon the affairs of our beloved country.

We beseech Thy guidance in our councils and decisions for the welfare of our Nation and its people.

We pray Thee, O Father of Peace, be Thou with our tireless President and Vice President and with all the leaders of our country as they walk the difficult path of statesmanship and diplomacy.

May we emerge from the agonizing struggle in which we are now engaged, united and strengthened by a common destiny.

Spread Thy mantle of peace over the four corners of the earth. Let every man, whatever his race, religion, or creed, recognize Thee as the father of us all, so that we may dwell in brotherhood and in tranquility.

May we be blessed with the greatness of soul which will enable us to rise above the everyday and behold the vision of the eternal.

May your efforts bring about the cessation of hatred and intolerance. May the law of Thy truth unite all nations into a bond of brotherhood so that no nation war against its brother nor hurt or destroy its neighbor. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones,